FREE FUNCTIONAL INEQUALITIES ON THE CIRCLE

IONEL POPESCU

ABSTRACT. In this paper we deal with free functional inequalities on the circle. There are some interesting changes as opposed to the classical case. For example, the free Poincaré inequality has a slight change which seems to account for the lack of invariance under rotations of the base measure. Another instance is the modified Wasserstein distance on the circle which provides the tools for analyzing transportation, Log-Sobolev, and HWI inequalities.

These new phenomena also indicate that they have a classical counterpart, which does not seem to have been investigated before.

arXiv:1511.05274v1 [math.PR] 17 Nov 2015

1. INTRODUCTION

An intensive area of research nowadays is functional inequalities. In the classical case these reflect various aspects of operator theory, mass transport, concentration of measure, isoperimetry and analysis of Markov processes.

To describe the setup, we start with a Riemannian manifold M and a probability measure ν on it. The classical transportation cost inequality states that for some $\rho > 0$ and any other choice of probability measure μ on M the following holds

$$\rho\, W_2^2(\mu,\nu) \leq E(\mu|\nu). \tag{$T(\rho)$}$$

Here $W_2(\mu,\nu)$ denotes the Wasserstein distance between μ and ν (probability measures of finite second moment) given by

$$W_2(\mu,\nu) = \inf_{\pi\in\Pi(\mu,\nu)} \left(\iint d(x,y)^2\pi(dx,dy)\right)^{1/2}$$

where $\Pi(\mu,\nu)$ stands for the set of probability measures on $M\times M$ with marginals μ and ν and $d(x,y)$ is the geodesic distance between the points x,y. Also we use here

$$E(\mu|\nu) = \int \log\frac{d\mu}{d\nu}\, d\mu$$

for the relative entropy of μ with respect to ν if $\mu << \nu$ and $+\infty$ otherwise.

The classical Log-Sobolev inequality states that for any μ

$$E(\mu|\nu) \leq \frac{1}{2\rho}\, I(\mu|\nu) \tag{$LSI(\rho)$}$$

where

$$I(\mu|\nu) = \int \left|\nabla \log\frac{d\mu}{d\nu}\right|^2 d\mu$$

is the Fisher information of μ with respect to ν defined in the case $\mu << \nu$ and $\frac{d\mu}{d\nu}$ being differentiable.

Another more refined inequality is the HWI inequality introduced in [19] which states that for any choice of the measure μ,

$$E(\mu|\nu) \leq \sqrt{I(\mu|\nu)}\, W_2(\mu,\nu) - \frac{\rho}{2}\, W_2^2(\mu,\nu). \tag{$HWI(\rho)$}$$

Finally the classical Poincaré's inequality states that any compactly supported and smooth function ψ on M,

$$\rho\, \mathrm{Var}_\nu(\psi) \leq \int |\nabla\psi|^2 \nu(dx) \tag{$P(\rho)$}$$

Ionel Popescu was partially supported by Simon Collaboration grant no. 318929.

where $\mathrm{Var}_\nu(\psi)=\int\psi^2(x)\nu(dx)-\big(\int\psi(x)\nu(dx)\big)\big)^2$ is the variance of ψ with respect to ν.

It is known that for measures ν on M of the form

$$\nu(dx)=e^{-V(x)}dx$$

where $V:M\to\mathbb{R}$, satisfies the famous Bakry-Émery condition

$$\mathrm{Hess}(V)+Ric\geq\rho,$$

then $T(\rho)$, $LSI(\rho)$, $HWI(\rho)$ and $P(\rho)$ hold true (see for a sample of the literature [19], [2], [14], [25], [9],[6], [10], or [3] in sub-Riemannian framework). The Gaussian model is the case of $V(x)=|x|^2/2+C$ on $\mathbb{R}^d$ and the Log-Sobolev in this case is due to [11], while the transportation was first introduced in [24].

The bridge from classical to free probability is usually done using random matrices (see for instance Voiculescu's work [27] and the monograph [26]). It was shown by Ben Arous and Guionnet in [1] that one can realize the free entropy as the rate function of the large deviations for the distribution of eigenvalues of $n\times n$ complex random matrix ensembles (see also [13]). To explain the main ideas, let $V:\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$ be a smooth function with enough growth at infinity and define the probability distribution

$$\mathbb{P}_n(dM)=\frac{1}{Z_n}\,e^{-n\mathrm{Tr}_n(V(M))}dM$$

on the set $\mathcal{H}_n$ of complex Hermitian $n\times n$ matrices where dM is the Lebesgue measure on $\mathcal{H}_n$. For a matrix M, set $\mu_n(M)=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^n\delta_{\lambda_k(M)}$ to be the distribution of eigenvalues of M. These are random variables with values in $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$, the set of probability measures on $\mathbb{R}$ and we know that they converge almost surely to a non-random measure μ_V on $\mathbb{R}$. For a measure μ on $\mathbb{R}$, the logarithmic energy with external field V is defined by

$$E(\mu)=\int V(x)\mu(dx)-\iint\log|x-y|\,\mu(dx)\mu(dy).$$

The minimizer of $E(\mu)$ over all probability measures on $\mathbb{R}$ is called the equilibrium measure μ_V. From [1] we learn that the distributions of $\{\mu_n\}_{n\geq1}$ under $\mathbb{P}_n$ satisfy a large deviations principle with scaling n^2 and rate function given by

$$R(\mu)=E(\mu)-E(\mu_V)$$

In the case of $V(x)=x^2/2$ we have the standard Gaussian Unitary Ensemble in random matrix theory which gives rise to the semicircular law as equilibrium measure.

Assume that $V''\geq2\rho$. Using the classical inequalities on large random matrices, for convex potentials, one can prove the analog of the transportation inequality (due initially to Biane and Voiculescu in [5] and then [12]) and Log-Sobolev (see [4]). A different method, still partially based on random matrices to prove a Brunn-Minkowski and from this to deduce the free transportation and Log-Sobolev is given in [15]. Another more direct approach is based on a method involving the mass transportation tools which are presented in [20] and [16]. To the point, the free transportation inequality states that for any probability measure on $\mathbb{R}$,

$$\rho\,W_2^2(\mu,\mu_V)\leq E(\mu)-E(\mu_V). \tag{1.1}$$

The free Log-Sobolev asserts that

$$E(\mu)-E(\mu_V)\leq\frac{1}{4\rho}\,I(\mu) \tag{1.2}$$

for any probability measure μ on $\mathbb{R}$ whose density with respect to the Lebegue measure is in $L^3(\mathbb{R})$, with

$$I(\mu)=\int\big(H\mu(x)-V'(x)\big)^2\mu(dx). \tag{1.3}$$

Here $H\mu=2\int\frac{1}{x-y}\mu(dx)$ stands for the Hilbert transform of μ.

The free Poincaré inequality was introduced in [16] and later carefully analyzed in [17]. It states that if the equilibrium measure μ_V of V has support $[-2,2]$, then,

$$\frac{2\rho}{\pi^2}\int_{-2}^{2}\int_{-2}^{2}\left(\frac{\phi(x)-\phi(y)}{x-y}\right)^2\frac{4-xy}{\sqrt{4-x^2}\sqrt{4-y^2}}\,dxdy \leq \int \phi'(x)^2\mu_V(dx), \tag{1.4}$$

for any smooth function ϕ on the interval $[-2,2]$. This is further refined in [7] for the case of the quadratic potential $V(x)=x^2/2$.

The purpose of this paper is to expand the study of free functional inequalities on the circle. Previously, the first such inequalities were introduced by Hiai, Petz and Ueda in [12]. Particularly, the transportation and Log-Sobolev inequalities on the circle were proved using unitary random matrix ensembles. We should point out a key fact which will play an important role in the sequel. In the random matrix approach from [12], one takes the Haar measure on $U(n)$, the space of unitary matrices. The main issue with this is that $U(n)$ has constant Ricci curvature constant except one dimension, in which it is degenerate. Therefore the typical Bakry-Émery criterion does not hold. The fix is to actually look at the subgroup of matrices with determinant one. This has the Ricci curvature constant and thus, we can apply the classical inequalities, which in the limit provides the free analogs. This phenomena produces various corrections as we will discuss below.

Our approach is not based on the random matrix approach, but rather on direct methods based on mass transport tools. We recapture the free transportation and Log-Sobolev along side with HWI and Brunn-Minkowski and also the free Poincaré inequality.

We start the discussion on our approach introducing first the free Poincaré inequality (which to our knowledge is new) similar to (1.4). If μ is a probability on the unit circle, we say it satisfies a free Poincaré inequality with constant $\rho>0$ if

$$2\rho\iint\left|\frac{f(z)-f(w)}{z-w}\right|^2\alpha(dz)\,\alpha(dw) \leq \mathrm{Var}_\mu(f') := \int|f'|^2d\mu-\left|\int f'\,d\mu\right|^2 \tag{1.5}$$

for any smooth function f on the circle. Here we denote by α the Haar measure on the circle. Notice that there are similarities and also differences to the classical analog and the free version (1.4). A difference from the classical counterpart is due to the fact that the left hand sides of (1.4) and (1.5) are independent of the measure μ. The other particularity of (1.5) is that as opposed to the (1.4) and the classical Poincaré inequality, the right hand side has an extra term, namely $\left|\int f'\,d\mu\right|^2$. In the case of $\mu=\alpha$, $\int f'd\alpha=0$ for any smooth function, thus the inequality, above takes the form

$$\iint\left|\frac{f(z)-f(w)}{z-w}\right|^2\alpha(dz)\,\alpha(dw) \leq \int|f'|^2d\mu$$

which has the same flavor as (1.5). It is worth pointing out that the Haar measure α is the unique measure on the circle which is invariant under rotations and thus the unique measure μ with the property that $\int f'd\mu=0$ for any smooth function on the circle. Therefore we can interpret the right hand term $\int f'd\mu$ as a form of measuring the lack of invariance under rotation for μ. This indicates that the free Poincaré inequality unveils an interesting phenomena.

Furthermore, given a potential Q on the circle, we define μ_Q to be the measure which maximizes

$$E_Q(\mu)=\int Qd\mu-\iint\log|x-y|\mu(dx)\mu(dy)$$

over all probability measures on the circle. In the case $Q\equiv 0$, the equilibrium measure μ_Q is the Haar measure α. We show that under the convexity assumption $Q''\geq\rho-1/2$, the equilibrium measure μ_Q satisfies $P(\rho)$.

The free transportation inequality associated to the potential Q (which we call $T(\rho)$) states that for any probability measure μ on $\mathbf{T}$ we have

$$\rho W_2(\mu,\mu_Q)\leq E_Q(\mu)-E_Q(\mu_Q). \tag{1.6}$$

Continuing to assume that $Q'' \geq \rho - 1/2$, the transportation inequality introduced in [12] using random matrix approximations is $T(\rho/2)$. In this paper we strengthen this inequality to the following

$$\frac{\rho}{2}\mathcal{W}_2(\mu,\mu_Q) \leq E_Q(\mu) - E_Q(\mu_Q), \tag{1.7}$$

where $\mathcal{W}_2$ is a larger quantity than the standard Wasserstein distance. The new distance here is defined as

$$\mathcal{W}_2(\mu,\nu) = \sup\left\{W_2(\bar{\mu},\bar{\nu}):\ \text{such that } \int x\,\bar{\mu}(dx) = \int x\,\bar{\nu}(dx),\right\}$$

where the supremum is taken over all choices of $u, v \in [0, 2\pi)$ and measures $\bar{\mu}$ on $[u, u + 2\pi)$ and $\bar{\nu}$ on $[v, v + 2\pi)$ such that $\exp_{\#}\bar{\mu} = \mu$ and $\exp_{\#}\bar{\nu} = \nu$ with $\exp(t) = e^{it}$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}$. This is discussed in Section 7. The main comment is that this version of the Wasserstein distance catches to some extent a phenomena which is similar to the one of Poincaré inequality, namely it encodes somehow that the circle acts on itself by rotations. Several of the standard transportation tools can be carried out for this new distance which are enough to show the transportation inequality (1.7). Worth noticing is the fact that even in the case $Q \equiv 0$ (when we have $\mu_Q = \alpha$) the inequality (1.7) is not sharp (see Proposition 6). We conjecture that the right coefficient in front of (1.7) is ρ not $\rho/2$.

Furthermore, we introduce and analyze the Log-Sobolev inequality $LSI(\rho)$ in the form (introduced in [12])

$$E_Q(\mu) - E_Q(\mu_Q) \leq \frac{1}{4\rho}I_Q(\mu) \tag{1.8}$$

with

$$I_Q(\mu) := \int (H\mu - Q')^2 d\mu - \left(\int Q' d\mu\right)^2 \quad \text{and} \quad H\mu(x) = -p.v.\int \frac{z+w}{z-w}\mu(dw).$$

Again under convexity assumption $Q'' \geq \rho - 1/2$, we prove $LSI(\rho/2)$ holds true using the transportation tools developed for the new distance. As in the case of transportation inequality $LSI(\rho/2)$ is not sharp and we conjecture that $LSI(\rho)$ should be the optimal version, at least in the case $Q \equiv 0$.

Another observation is that we see the same phenomena as in the Poincaré inequality, namely there is a correction in $I_Q(\mu)$ in comparison to (1.3) which has an extra term. Though we do not fully know how to interpret this, it is perhaps another manifestation of the fact that the circle acts on itself by rotations.

Under the same convexity conditions, we also prove the HWI inequality which is stated as

$$E_Q(\mu) - E_Q(\mu_Q) \leq I_Q(\mu)\mathcal{W}_2(\mu,\mu_Q) - \frac{\rho}{2}\mathcal{W}_2(\mu,\mu_Q)^2. \tag{1.9}$$

It is seems very difficult to get this inequality using random matrix approximations. Again this is probably not sharp as the constant $\rho/2$ should be ρ, though we do not have an argument for it. We also do not know if this holds for the standard Wasserstein distance W_2 instead of $\mathcal{W}_2$.

Another inequality which follows very easily in this framework is the Brunn-Minkowski and is discussed in Section 8.

Another part of this paper deals with the relations between these inequalities which parallel the hierarchy of inequalities in the classical case from [19].

If the convexity is important in deducing the inequalities thus far, we also treat inequalities which are potential independent as it was first introduced in [18] and then also discussed in [21]. The main transportation inequality uses the $\mathcal{W}_1$ distance instead of $\mathcal{W}_2$.

One aspect which transpires in the free case is the particular structure of the circle, and perhaps more precisely the fact that the circle acts on itself by rotations. This perspective can be taken back to the classical case where it seems very natural to ask about refinements of classical inequalities in the case of manifolds with an action of a Lie group. Though we posed this question to several experts in the area, we have not been pointed to any reference in the literature. We suggest a version of Poincaré inequality in this framework, though the counterpart of the Wasserstein distance is probably more intricate.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 contains the preliminaries. In Section 3 we discuss the main results around the minimization of the logarithmic potentials and introduce a number of operators

which play an important role in rest of the paper. Following this we introduce the free Poincaré inequality in Section 4 which is then expanded in Section 5 and 6. In Section 7 we discuss the Wasserstein distance. Next section introduces the free transportation, Log-Sobolev, HWI, and Brunn-Minkowski. The following section discusses the implications between these inequalities. Section 10 gives the cases of potential independent versions of the inequalities in discussion. The last section is a return to the classical case which asks some natural questions about the functional inequalities under the presence of a Lie group acting on the underlying space.

2. Preliminaries

In this section we introduce some basic notions and notations.

For any complex number $z \in \mathbb{C}$, $\Re(z)$ and $\Im(z)$ will stand for the real, respectively imaginary parts.

The normalized Haar measure on $\mathbf{T}$ will be denoted by α and is given formally as the unique measure of mass 1 which is invariant under rotations on $\mathbf{T}$. A more concrete way of computing with it goes through $\int f(z)\alpha(dz) = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f(e^{ix})dx$ for any continuous function $f : \mathbf{T} \to \mathbb{C}$.

The inner product in $L^2(\mu)$ is denoted by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_\mu$ and if no measure is specified, this inner product is taken with respect to the Haar measure α. We also use the notation $L^2_0(\mu)$ for the space of functions with mean 0 with respect to the μ.

For a smooth function on $\mathbf{T}$ we define

$$\phi'(z) = \frac{d}{dt}\Big|_{t=0}\phi(ze^{it})$$

with the obvious extension to the higher derivatives.

The rotation invariance property of α is equivalent to the fact that for any C^1 function $\phi : \mathbf{T} \to \mathbb{C}$,

$$\int \phi' \, d\alpha = 0. \tag{2.1}$$

In particular for $\phi(z) = z^n$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, $n \neq 0$, $\phi'(z) = niz^n$ and thus,

$$\int z^n \, d\alpha = 0. \tag{2.2}$$

This in turn yields that $\{z^n\}_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}$ form an orthonormal basis in $L^2(\alpha)$.

A *potential* on $\mathbf{T}$ is simply a function $Q : \mathbf{T} \to \mathbb{R}$ which we assume to be at least continuous. For a probability measure μ on $\mathbf{T}$, the *logarithmic energy with external field* Q is given by

$$E_Q(\mu) = \int Q \, d\mu - \iint \log|x-y|\mu(dx)\mu(dy). \tag{2.3}$$

It is known that given a continuous $Q : \mathbf{T} \to \mathbb{R}$, (see [23]) there is a unique minimizer μ_Q on the set of probability measures on $\mathbf{T}$. We will denote for simplicity $E_Q = E_Q(\mu_Q)$. In what follows, we denote the support of the measure μ by $\mathrm{supp}\mu$.

The variational characterization of the equilibrium measure μ_Q of (2.3) on the set $\mathbf{T}$ (cf. [23, Thm.I.1.3]) is

$$\begin{aligned} Q(x) &\geq 2\int \log|x-y|\mu(dy) + C \quad \text{quasi-everywhere on } \mathbf{T} \\ Q(x) &= 2\int \log|x-y|\mu(dy) + C \quad \text{quasi-everywhere on } \mathrm{supp}\mu. \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

This means, in particular that the equality on $\mathrm{supp}\mu$ is actually almost surely with respect to any measure of finite logarithmic energy.

As we will see below in Corollary 1, the equilibrium measure on $\mathbf{T}$ with no potential ($Q \equiv 0$) is simply the Haar measure α.

Very often we will move measures and functions from $\mathbf{T}$ to the interval $[-\pi, \pi)$ and we will do this without specifying it all the time. As a piece of notation, we will fix along the discussion the potential Q on $\mathbf{T}$ and set $V(x) = Q(e^{ix})$. With this mapping, the characterization of the probability measure μ_Q

becomes the characterization of the probability measure μ_V on $[-\pi,\pi)$ which is the minimizer of the energy

$$E_V(\mu)=\int V(x)\nu(dx)-\iint \log|e^{ix}-e^{iy}|\nu(dx)\nu(dy). \tag{2.5}$$

The variational characterization of μ_V becomes

$$\begin{aligned} &V(x)\geq 2\int \log|e^{ix}-e^{iy}|\mu_V(dy)+C \quad \text{quasi-everywhere on } \mathbf{T}\\ &V(x)=2\int \log|e^{ix}-e^{iy}|\mu_V(dy)+C \quad \text{quasi-everywhere on } \ \text{supp}\mu_V. \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

It is useful to observe that in the case Q is C^1, then we have

$$\int Q'\,d\mu_Q=0. \tag{2.7}$$

Indeed, taking the measures $\mu_t=(\theta_t)_{\#}\mu_Q$ for small t and $\theta_t(z)=e^{it}z$ and noticing that

$$E_Q(\mu_t)-E_Q=\int (Q(e^{it}z)-Q(z))\mu_Q(dz)$$

is minimized for $t=0$, concludes (2.7). In this paper, if $\phi: X\to Y$ is a measurable map and ν is a measure on X, then the pushforward $\phi_{\#}\nu$ is defined as

$$(\phi_{\#}\nu)(A)=\nu(\phi^{-1}(A)) \text{ for any } A\subset Y.$$

3. Minimization of the logarithmic energy

The main results in this section are based on the following lemma.

Lemma 1. *For any $z,w\in\mathbf{T}$ with $z\neq w$, then*

$$\log|z-w|=-\sum_{n\geq 1}\frac{1}{n}\Re(z^n\bar{w}^n),$$

where the series is convergent.

Also for any finite measure μ on $\mathbf{T}$,

$$\int \log|z-w|\mu(dw)=-\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}^*}\frac{1}{2|n|}\Re\left(\left(\int w^{-n}\mu(dw)\right)z^n\right) \tag{3.1}$$

$$\iint \log|z-w|\mu(dx)\mu(dy)=-\sum_{n\geq 1}\frac{1}{n}\left|\int z^n\mu(dz)\right|^2.$$

Proof. Follows from the fact that for $z\neq w$,

$$\log|z-w|=\log|1-z\bar{w}|=\Re\log(1-z\bar{w})=-\sum_{n\geq 1}\frac{1}{n}\Re(z^n\bar{w}^n),$$

where we use the principal branch of the logarithm, the one which is real on the real axis. Note that the series $\sum_{n\geq 1}\frac{1}{n}z^n\bar{w}^n$ converges for any $z,w\in\mathbf{T}$ with $z\neq w$. □

The first application is the following.

Corollary 1. *For the Haar measure α on $\mathbf{T}$,*

$$\int \log|z-w|\alpha(dw)=0,\quad \forall z\in\mathbf{T}.$$

Moreover, if μ is a measure on $\mathbf{T}$ such that

$$\int \log|z-w|\mu(dw)=c,\quad \textit{almost everywhere for all } z\in\mathbf{T},$$

where "almost everywhere" is with respect to the Haar measure, then $\mu = \alpha$ and $c = 0$.

With this at hand we can continue with the first result, which is a way of solving the equilibrium measure for a given potential.

Theorem 1. *Assume that $Q : \mathbf{T} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a C^3 potential and $A \in \mathbb{C}$ is a constant. Then, there is a unique signed measure μ on $\mathbf{T}$ of finite total variation which solves*

$$\begin{cases} 2\int \log|z-w|\mu(dw) = Q(z) + C \text{ almost everywhere for } z \in \mathbf{T}, \\ \mu(\mathbf{T}) = A, \end{cases} \tag{3.2}$$

where "almost everywhere" is with respect to α. The solution μ is given by $\mu(dz) = u(z)\alpha(dz)$ where

$$u(z) = A + \int \frac{i(Q'(z) - Q'(w))(z+w)}{(z-w)}\alpha(dw) = A + 2\int \frac{(Q'(z) - Q'(w))\Im(zw^{-1})}{|z-w|^2}\alpha(dw). \tag{3.3}$$

In addition, the constant C must be given by $C = -\int Q\, d\alpha$.

Moreover, for any C^1 function ϕ on $\mathbf{T}$,

$$\int \phi(x)\mu(dx) = A\int \phi\, d\alpha - \iint \frac{(Q(z) - Q(w))(\phi(z) - \phi(w))}{|z-w|^2}\,\alpha(dz)\alpha(dw). \tag{3.4}$$

Proof. The uniqueness follows easily from Corollary 1, and thus we only have to deal with existence.

Now, write Q as the power series

$$Q(z) = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} \left(\int Q(w)w^n\alpha(dw)\right) z^n.$$

Notice that because Q is C^3, the coefficients $\int Q(w)w^n\alpha(dw)$ behave as $1/n^3$ for large n.

Next, we look for a solution of (3.2) in the form $\mu = u\, d\alpha$ which with the help of (3.1) gives

$$-\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}^*} \frac{1}{|n|}\left(\int w^{-n}u(w)\alpha(dw)\right) z^n = C + \int Q\, d\alpha + \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}^*}\left(\int Q(w)w^n\alpha(dw)\right) z^n$$

from which equating the coefficients of z^n for $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, we first get that $C = -\int Q\, d\alpha$ and

$$\int w^{-n}u(w)\,\alpha(dw) = -|n|\int w^n Q(w)\,\alpha(dw) = i\mathrm{sign}(n)\int w^n(Q'(z) - Q'(w))\,\alpha(dw) \quad \forall n \neq 0.$$

Now we recapture the function u in terms of its Fourier coefficients, as

$$\begin{aligned} u(z) &= A + i\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}^*} \mathrm{sign}(n)\left(\int w^n(Q'(z) - Q'(w))\alpha(dw)\right) z^{-n} \\ &= A - 2\sum_{n\geq 1} \Im\left[\left(\int w^n(Q'(z) - Q'(w))\alpha(dw)\right) z^{-n}\right] \\ &= A + i\left(\int \frac{(Q'(z) - Q'(w))(z+w)}{(z-w)}\alpha(dw)\right) \end{aligned}$$

which gives (3.3).

To deal with formula (3.4), we expand ϕ as a Fourier series and then write

$$\begin{aligned}\int \phi\, d\mu = \int \phi u\, d\alpha &= \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} \left(\int \phi(z) z^{-n}\, \alpha(dz)\right)\left(\int u(w) w^{-n}\, \alpha(dw)\right)\\ &= A\int \phi\, d\alpha + \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}^*} |n| \iint w^n z^{-n} Q(w)\phi(z)\, \alpha(dw)\alpha(dz)\\ &= A\int \phi\, d\alpha + \sum_{n\geq 1} n \iint w^n z^{-n}(Q(z)-Q(w))(\phi(z)-\phi(w))\, \alpha(dw)\alpha(dz)\\ &= A\int \phi\, d\alpha + \iint \left(\sum_{n\geq 1} n w^n z^{-n}\right)(Q(z)-Q(w))(\phi(z)-\phi(w))\, \alpha(dw)\alpha(dz)\\ =&A\int \phi\, d\alpha + \iint \frac{(Q(z)-Q(w))(\phi(z)-\phi(w))wz^{-1}}{(1-wz^{-1})^2}\, \alpha(dw)\alpha(dz)\end{aligned}$$

which combined with the easily checked identity $\frac{wz^{-1}}{(1-wz^{-1})^2} = -\frac{1}{|z-w|^2}$ satisfied for distinct $z, w \in \mathbf{T}$ we conclude (3.4). □

One particularly interesting consequence of the above result is that under some convexity assumption on Q, we can conclude full support condition. This property is well known for the case of measures on the real line, which states that if the potential is convex, then the support is one interval. More precisely, in this framework we have the following.

Corollary 2. *Assume Q is a C^3 potential on $\mathbf{T}$ with $Q''(z) \geq \beta - \frac{1}{2\log 2}$ with $\beta > 0$ at any $z \in \mathbf{T}$. Then μ_Q has a continuous and positive density with respect to α and*

$$\frac{d\mu}{d\alpha} \geq 2\beta \log 2.$$

Proof. Consider the argument function of a complex number, $\mathrm{Arg}(z)$ to be the angle between the vector z and the positive real axis, thus defined in $(-\pi, \pi]$. Now, the convexity of Q reads as $t \to Q(we^{it})$ is a convex function on $(-\pi, \pi]$. Consequently,

$$\frac{Q'(we^{it}) - Q'(w)}{t} > \beta - \frac{1}{2\log 2}.$$

Now for another complex number $z \in \mathbf{T}$, we can take $t = \mathrm{Arg}(zw^{-1})$ and thus obtain

$$\frac{Q'(z) - Q'(w)}{\mathrm{Arg}(zw^{-1})} > \beta - \frac{1}{2\log 2}.$$

From our choice of the argument, $\Im(z)$ and $\mathrm{Arg}(z)$ have the same sign and then

$$\frac{(Q'(z)-Q'(w))\Im(zw^{-1})}{|z-w|^2} > \left(\beta - \frac{1}{2\log 2}\right)\frac{\mathrm{Arg}(zw^{-1})\Im(zw^{-1})}{|z-w|^2} = \left(\beta - \frac{1}{2\log 2}\right)\frac{\mathrm{Arg}(zw^{-1})\Im(zw^{-1})}{|1-zw^{-1}|^2}.$$

Next, solving (3.2) with $A = 1$ gives the solution u from (3.3) and using the above inequality leads to

$$\begin{aligned}u(z) &\geq 1 + 2\left(\beta - \frac{1}{2\log 2}\right)\int \frac{\mathrm{Arg}(zw^{-1})\Im(zw^{-1})}{|1-zw^{-1}|^2}\alpha(dw) = 1 + 2\left(\beta - \frac{1}{2\log 2}\right)\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{t\sin(t)}{4\sin^2(t/2)}dt\\ &= 1 + 2\left(\beta - \frac{1}{2\log 2}\right)\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_0^{\pi} t\cot(t/2)dt = 2\beta\log 2 > 0.\end{aligned}$$

The continuity of u is clear from (3.3). □

We introduce now the operators which play an important role in the economy of the Poincaré's inequality.

Definition 1. *For a C^2 function $\phi : \mathbf{T} \to \mathbb{C}$, set*

$$
\begin{aligned}
(\mathcal{E}\phi)(z) &= -2\int \log|z-w|\phi(w)\alpha(dw),\\
(\mathcal{N}\phi)(z) &= \int \frac{(\phi'(z)-\phi'(w))(z+w)}{i(z-w)}\alpha(dw) = -2\int \frac{(\phi'(z)-\phi'(w))\Im(zw^{-1})}{|z-w|^2}\alpha(dw)\\
(\mathcal{U}\phi)(z) &= \int \frac{(\phi(z)-\phi(w))(1-zw)}{(z-w)}\alpha(dw) + \phi(z)(z+1/z)\\
(\mathcal{V}\phi)(z) &= \int \frac{(\phi(z)-\phi(w))(1-zw)}{(z-w)}\alpha(dw)
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.5}
$$

For a C^3 function ϕ on $\mathbf{T}$, Theorem 1 states that $\mathcal{N}\phi$ is the unique solution ψ to

$$
\begin{cases} 2\int \log|z-w|\psi(w)\,\alpha(dw) = -\phi(z) + \int \phi\, d\alpha \text{ almost everywhere for } z\in\mathbf{T},\\ \int \psi\, d\alpha = 0. \end{cases}
\tag{3.6}
$$

Here we collect a number of properties relating these operators.

Proposition 1. (1) *For any C^2 function ϕ on $\mathbf{T}$, $\mathcal{E}\phi$ and $\mathcal{N}\phi$ are also C^2 functions. In addition,*

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}\mathcal{N}\phi &= \phi - \int \phi\, d\alpha,\\
\mathcal{N}\mathcal{E}\phi &= \phi - \int \phi\, d\alpha.
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.7}
$$

(2) *For any C^1 functions $\phi, \psi : \mathbf{T} \to \mathbb{C}$,*

$$
\langle \mathcal{N}\phi, \psi\rangle = \iint \frac{(\phi(z)-\phi(w))(\overline{\psi(z)-\psi(w)})}{|z-w|^2}\,\alpha(dz)\,\alpha(dw).
\tag{3.8}
$$

In particular, $\langle \mathcal{N}\phi,\psi\rangle = \langle \phi, \mathcal{N}\psi\rangle$ and $\langle \mathcal{N}\phi,\phi\rangle \geq 0$.

(3) *$\mathcal{E}1 = 0$ and $\mathcal{E}z^{\pm n} = \frac{1}{n}z^{\pm n}$, $n \geq 1$. For any $n \geq 0$, $\mathcal{N}z^{\pm n} = nz^{\pm n}$.*

(4) *The operators $\mathcal{U}$ and $\mathcal{V}$ are characterized by*

$$
\mathcal{U}z^n = \begin{cases} z^{n+1}, & n \geq 1\\ z+z^{-1}, & n = 0\\ z^{n-1}, & n \leq -1. \end{cases} \quad \text{and } \mathcal{V}z^n = \begin{cases} z^{n-1}, & \text{for } n \geq 1\\ 0, & n = 0\\ z^{n+1}, & n \leq -1 \end{cases}
\tag{3.9}
$$

In addition $\mathcal{U}^* = \mathcal{V}$, $\mathcal{V}^* = \mathcal{U}$. Also, $\mathcal{V}\mathcal{U} = I$ while $\mathcal{U}\mathcal{V} = I - \Pi$, where Π is the projection on the set of constant functions.

(5) *We have*

$$
\mathcal{V}\mathcal{N}\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{N} + I.
$$

(6) *Set $\mathcal{L}\phi = \mathcal{N}^2\phi$ for C^2 functions. Then*

$$
\langle \mathcal{L}\phi, \psi\rangle = \int \phi'\bar{\psi}'\, d\alpha,
\tag{3.10}
$$

and

$$
(\mathcal{L}\phi)(z) = -\phi''(z)
$$

which is the negative Laplacian on $\mathbf{T}$.

Proof. All the properties follow from Theorem 1 except (3.9) which is a straightforward check on monomials and the definition.

□

Another proposition relates the solution to (3.2) in terms of the operator $\mathcal{N}$.

Proposition 2. *For a C^3 potential Q on $\mathbf{T}$, the solution μ of (3.6) is written as*

$$\mu = (1 - \mathcal{N}Q)\,\alpha. \tag{3.11}$$

If in addition, the minimizer of E_Q on $\mathbf{T}$ is μ_Q and has full support, then

$$E_Q = \int Q\,d\alpha - \frac{1}{2}\langle \mathcal{N}Q, Q\rangle = \int Q\,d\alpha - \frac{1}{2}\iint \left|\frac{Q(z)-Q(w)}{z-w}\right|^2 \alpha(dz)\,\alpha(dw). \tag{3.12}$$

Proof. The only thing we need to prove here is the last item which follows from

$$E_Q = \int Q d\mu_Q - \iint \log|z-w|\mu_Q(dz)\mu_Q(dw),$$

where $\mu_Q = (1-\mathcal{N}Q)\ \alpha$. Then it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} E_Q &= \int Q\,d\alpha - \langle \mathcal{N}Q, Q\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\Big\langle \mathcal{E}\Big(1-\mathcal{N}Q\Big), \Big(1-\mathcal{N}Q\Big)\Big\rangle \\ &= \int Q\,d\alpha - \langle \mathcal{N}Q, Q\rangle - \frac{1}{2}\Big\langle \Big(Q - \int Q dz\Big), \Big(1-\mathcal{N}Q\Big)\Big\rangle \\ &= \int Q\,d\alpha - \frac{1}{2}\,\langle \mathcal{N}Q, Q\rangle \end{aligned}$$

which combined with (3.8) gives (3.12)

□

We now discuss a perturbation property of E_Q, when the potential Q is perturbed by $Q + tf$.

Theorem 2. *Assume that Q is of class C^3 and $\mu_Q = u\,\alpha$ with $\inf_{z\in\mathbf{T}} u(z) > 0$. Then for any C^2 functions $f, g : \mathbf{T} \to \mathbb{R}$,*

$$\mu_{Q+tf+t^2g} = \mu_Q - t\mathcal{N}f\,\alpha - t^2\mathcal{N}g\,\alpha. \tag{3.13}$$

taken in the sense of distributions. In addition,

$$E_{Q+tf+t^2g} = E_Q + t\int f\,d\mu_Q - t^2\left(\int g\,d\mu_Q - \frac{1}{2}\langle \mathcal{N}f, f\rangle\right) + o(t^2). \tag{3.14}$$

Proof. Since, $w(z) = 1 - \mathcal{N}Q(z) > 0$ for all $z \in \mathbf{T}$, it follows that for small t and all $z \in \mathbf{T}$, it is also true that $1 - \mathcal{N}Q(z) + t\mathcal{N}f(z) > 0$ for all $z \in \mathbf{T}$. Now looking at the densities as described by (3.11), it is easy to show (3.13).

For the second part, use the representation from (3.12). □

4. Poincaré Inequality

4.1. **General Properties.** Now we have introduced all ingredients for the statement and elementary properties of the Poincaré's inequality.

Definition 2. *We say that a probability measure μ on $\mathbf{T}$ satisfies a free Poincaré inequality with constant $\rho > 0$, denoted $P(\rho)$, if*

$$2\rho\iint \left|\frac{f(z)-f(w)}{z-w}\right|^2 \alpha(dz)\,\alpha(dw) \le \mathrm{Var}_\mu(f') := \int |f'|^2 d\mu - \left|\int f'\,d\mu\right|^2 \tag{4.1}$$

holds for any smooth $f : \mathbf{T} \to \mathbb{C}$.

The expression on the left hand side appears also in [8] in relation to fluctuations of functions of random matrices on the unitary group. One can argue as in [16] that using Poincaré's inequality on large matrices, one can deduce some version of the free inequality for some sufficiently regular functions.

Notice that, as opposed to the classical Poincaré where the left hand side depends on the measure μ through its variance, in this case the left hand side is independent of the measure μ. Also, the left hand side is no longer a projection but some sort of second order operator, whose Dirichlet form is the $L^2(\alpha\times\alpha)$ norm of the non-commutative derivative $\frac{f(z)-f(w)}{z-w}$.

In the case of $\mu = \alpha$, since $\int f' \, d\alpha = 0$ for any smooth f, the free Poincaré inequality is equivalent to

$$2\rho \iint \left| \frac{f(z) - f(w)}{z - w} \right|^2 \alpha(dz)\, \alpha(dw) \leq \int |f'|^2 d\alpha.$$

A few elementary properties are collected in the following statement.

Proposition 3. *Assume μ satisfies $P(\rho)$. The following are true.*

(1) *μ has support $\mathbf{T}$. Moreover, if $d\mu = w\, dz$, with $w \in C^2(\mathbf{T})$, then $w(z) > 0$ for all $z \in \mathbf{T}$.*
(2) *The constant ρ in (4.1) satisfies*

$$\rho \leq \frac{1}{2}$$

with equality if and only if $\mu = \alpha$.
(3) *For any C^1 function $f : \mathbf{T} \to \mathbb{C}$,*

$$\mathrm{Var}_\alpha(f) \leq \iint \left| \frac{f(z) - f(w)}{z - w} \right|^2 \alpha(dz)\, \alpha(dw), \tag{4.2}$$

with $\mathrm{Var}_\nu(f) = \int |f|^2 \, d\nu - \left| \int f \, d\nu \right|^2$ for any measure ν. In fact, this inequality is equivalent to $P(1/2)$ for the Haar measure α with equality in (4.2) or (4.1) being attained only for $f(z) = az$, $a \in \mathbb{C}$.
(4) *If $\mu = w\, \alpha$, with $w \geq \rho$ on $\mathbf{T}$, then μ satisfies $P(\frac{\rho^2}{2})$.*

Proof. (1) Assume by contradiction that there is an open set $J \subset \mathbf{T}$ such that $\mu(J) = 0$. Take now, an open set J_2 such that $\bar{J}_2 \subset J$ and pick a smooth function $0 \leq f \leq 1$ which is 0 outside J and 1 on J_2. Apply now Poincaré to get a contradiction.

(2) Apply (4.1) for $f(z) = z$ to show that $2\rho \leq 1$. Now, if $\rho = 1/2$, then, apply (4.1) for $f = g + rz$ and thus conclude that

$$\iint \left| \frac{g(z) - g(w)}{z - w} \right|^2 \alpha(dz)\, \alpha(dw) + 2r \iint \Re\left(\frac{g(z) - g(w)}{z - w} \right) \alpha(dz)\, \alpha(dw) + r^2 \leq \int |g'|^2 d\mu + 2r \int \Re(g'(z) z) \mu(dz) + r^2.$$

Since this is true for any $r \in \mathbb{R}$, it yields

$$\iint \Re\left(\frac{g(z) - g(w)}{z - w} \right) \alpha(dz)\, \alpha(dw) = \int \Re(g'(z)\bar{z}) \mu(dz)$$

which in turn gives

$$\iint \frac{g(z) - g(w)}{z - w} \, \alpha(dz)\, \alpha(dw) = \int g'(z) \bar{z} \mu(dz).$$

Now, using the operator $\mathcal{N}$, the left hand side is precisely $\frac{1}{2}\langle \mathcal{N} g, z\rangle = \frac{1}{2}\langle \mathcal{N} g, \mathcal{N} z\rangle = \frac{1}{2}\langle \mathcal{L} g, z\rangle = \int g'(z)\bar{z}\, dz$, and thus we can reinterpreted the equality above as $\int g'(z)\bar{z}\, \mu(dz) = \int g'(z)\bar{z}\, dz$ for any smooth function g, which is equivalent to $\mu = \alpha$.

(3) This is a simple application of the fact that the Poincaré in this case is translated into $\mathcal{N} \leq \mathcal{N}^2$, which is equivalent to the spectral gap of $\mathcal{N}$, exactly what is described in (4.2).

(4) This is immediate from the following sequence of inequalitites

$$\iint \left| \frac{f(z) - f(w)}{z - w} \right|^2 \alpha(dz)\, \alpha(dw) \leq \int |f'(z)|^2 \alpha(dz) = \frac{1}{2} \iint |f'(z) - f'(w)|^2 \alpha(dz)\alpha(dw)$$
$$\leq \frac{1}{2\rho^2} \iint |f'(z) - f'(w)|^2 \mu(dz)\mu(dw) = \frac{1}{\rho^2} \mathrm{Var}_\mu(f')$$

which is $P(\rho^2/2)$ for μ. □

5. Houdré-Kagan type refinements

In this section we want to give some refinements for the Poincare inequality in the case of the Haar measure α. To do this, we use the idea from [22]. The starting point is the following

Proposition 4. *For any smooth functions ϕ, ψ on $\mathbf{T}$ that*

$$\langle \mathcal{N}\phi, \psi\rangle = \langle \mathcal{E}\phi', \psi'\rangle \tag{5.1}$$

Proof. It suffices to check this for the case of $\phi(z) = z^n$ and $\psi(z) = z^m$ with n, m an integer numbers. If $n = 0$, both sides are 0 and the equality is trivial. If $n \neq 0$, then, since $\phi' = in\phi$ and $\psi' = im\psi$ combined with $\mathcal{N}\phi = |n|\phi$ and $\mathcal{E}\phi = \frac{1}{|n|}\phi$, the identity is immediately checked. □

In particular, since $\mathcal{E}$ is a bounded operator from $L^2(\mathbf{T})$ and its spectrum is 0,1,1/2,1/3,..., we obtain another proof of the Poincaré inequality $P(1/2)$ for α.

What we want to do it refine this argument and for this matter we follow a similar argument to the one exposed in [21]. The main ingredient in this writing of the operator $\mathcal{N} - I$ is the form $(\partial^c)^*\partial^c$, where ∂^c is going to be defined below. Before we do that we recall the definition of the non-commutative derivative introduced by Voiculescu. It is defined on polynomials in z and z^{-1} over $\mathbf{T}$ by the rule

$$\partial(P \otimes Q) = (\partial P)(1 \otimes Q) + (P \otimes 1)(\partial Q).$$

Alternatively, this can be defined on monomials z^n for integer values of n by

$$\partial(z^n) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} z^i \otimes z^{n-1-i}$$

and then extend by linearity to all polynomials. We need to adjust this a little bit for our purpose by setting the following

$$\partial_c(z^n) = \begin{cases} 0 & n = 0 \\ \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} z^i \otimes z^{n-i} & n \geq 1 \\ \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} z^{-i} \otimes z^{n+i} & n \leq -1 \end{cases}$$

and extend this by linearity. To some extent, this resembles the same flavor as the derivative ∂, with the adjustment that the derivative of z^n on the circle (according to our definition) is not inz^{n-1} but inz^n. If we insist, we can relate ∂_c to ∂ as follows. First, set $\mathcal{P}^+$ to be the set of polynomials in z with no free coefficient and similarly set $\mathcal{P}^-$ to be the set of polynomials in z^{-1} with no free coefficient. Then,

$$\partial_c(f) = \begin{cases} \partial(z^{\pm 1}f) - f \otimes 1 - 1 \otimes f & f \in \mathcal{P}^{\pm} \\ 0 & f \equiv \text{const.} \end{cases}$$

Now, let's set

$$\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{N} - I.$$

This is a non-negative operator on $L^2_0(\alpha)$. Notice here that (3.8) is precisely the following statement

$$\langle \mathcal{N}\phi, \psi\rangle = \langle \partial\phi, \partial\psi\rangle_{\alpha\otimes\alpha}.$$

Indeed, this is so because

$$\partial(z^n) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} z^k \otimes z^{n-1-k}.$$

Now, we want a similar representation for $\mathcal{M}$ instead of $\mathcal{N}$ and this is the reason for introducing ∂_c for which a simple calculation reveals that for any polynomials $\phi, \psi \in L^2_0(\alpha)$,

$$\langle \mathcal{M}\phi, \psi\rangle = \langle \partial_c\phi, \partial_c\psi\rangle_{\alpha\otimes\alpha}. \tag{5.2}$$

Now, observe that for any polynomials ϕ, ψ, $\phi', \psi' \in L^2_0(\alpha)$ and

$$\langle \mathcal{E}\phi', \psi'\rangle = \langle (I + \mathcal{M})^{-1}\phi', \psi'\rangle = \langle \phi', \psi'\rangle - \langle \mathcal{M}(I + \mathcal{M})^{-1}\phi', \psi'\rangle.$$

Furthermore, the key now is to write

$$\langle \mathcal{M}(I+\mathcal{M})^{-1}\phi', \psi'\rangle = \langle \partial_c (I+\mathcal{M})^{-1}\phi', \partial_c \psi'\rangle \tag{5.3}$$

The next step is to commute the operators ∂_c with $(I+\mathcal{M})^{-1}$. To do so, we need to commute $\mathcal{M}$ and ∂_c. The first obstacle here is that $\mathcal{M}$ is defined only on L^2_0 while ∂_c takes functions into tensors. Thus we need to extend the operator $\mathcal{M}$ to tensors. We do this as follows:

$$\mathcal{M}^{(2)}(P\otimes Q) = (\mathcal{M}P)\otimes Q + P\otimes(\mathcal{M}Q).$$

With this definition we claim that

$$\partial_c \mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{M}^{(2)} + I)\partial_c. \tag{5.4}$$

Indeed, it is sufficient to check this on functions of the form $\phi(z) = z^n$. For $n = -1, 0, 1$, both sides are equal to 0. For $n \geq 2$, $\mathcal{M}\phi = (n-1)\phi$, while $\partial_c \phi = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} z^i \otimes z^{n-i}$ and $\mathcal{M}^{(2)}(z^i \otimes z^{n-i}) = (n-2) z^i \otimes z^{n-i}$ which proves the claim. In the case $n \leq -2$, $\mathcal{M}\phi = (-n-1)\phi$ while $\partial_c \phi = \sum_{i=1}^{-n+1} z^{-i} \otimes z^{n+i}$ and $\mathcal{M}^{(2)}(z^{-i}\otimes z^{n+i}) = (-n-2) z^i \otimes z^{n+i}$ which again confirms the formula.

With these considerations, we now see that

$$\partial_c(\mathcal{M}+I) = (\mathcal{M}^{(2)} + 2I)\partial_c.$$

and thus

$$\partial_c(\mathcal{M}^{(2)}+2I)^{-1} = \partial_c(\mathcal{M}+I)^{-1}$$

Therefore, if go back to (5.3), we continue

$$\langle \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{M}+I)^{-1}\phi', \psi'\rangle = \langle (\mathcal{M}^{(2)}+2I)^{-1}\partial_c\phi', \partial_c\psi'\rangle$$

Now we proceed by writing

$$\langle (\mathcal{M}^{(2)}+2I)^{-1}\partial_c\phi', \partial_c\psi'\rangle = \frac{1}{2}\langle \partial_c\phi', \partial_c\psi'\rangle - \frac{1}{2}\langle \mathcal{M}^{(2)}(\mathcal{M}^{(2)}+2I)^{-1}\partial_c\phi', \partial_c\psi'\rangle$$

Next, we want to extend this to higher orders. To do this, we define inductively the operators $\mathcal{M}^{(k)}$ by the prescription

$$\mathcal{M}^{(k)}(P\otimes Q) = (\mathcal{M}^{(k-1)}P)\otimes Q + P\otimes(\mathcal{M}Q)$$

for any $(k-1)$ tensor P and any 1 tensor Q. In addition to these, we define higher versions of ∂_c by

$$\partial_c^{(k)} = (\partial_c \otimes I^{(k)})\partial_c^{(k-1)}.$$

We claim that

$$(\partial_c \otimes I^{(k-1)})\mathcal{M}^{(k)} = (\mathcal{M}^{(k+1)} + I)(\partial_c \otimes I^{(k-1)}). \tag{5.5}$$

To see why this is so, we use induction. For $k=1$, this is exactly (5.4). If we assume the statement to be true for $k \geq 1$, then, by definition of $\mathcal{M}^{(k)}$, we can write

$$\begin{aligned}(\partial_c \otimes I^{(k-1)})\mathcal{M}^{(k)} &= \partial_c \otimes I^{(k-1)}(\mathcal{M}^{(k-1)}\otimes I + I^{(k-1)}\otimes\mathcal{M}) = ((\partial_c\otimes I^{(k-2)})\mathcal{M}^{(k-1)})\otimes I + \partial_c\otimes I^{(k-2)}\otimes\mathcal{M}\\ &= ((\mathcal{M}^{(k)}+I)(\partial_c\otimes I^{(k-1)}) + \partial_c\otimes I^{(k-2)}\otimes\mathcal{M}\\ &= (\mathcal{M}^{(k)}\otimes I + I^{(k)}\otimes\mathcal{M})\partial_c\otimes I^{(k-1)} + \partial_c\otimes I^{(k-1)} = (\mathcal{M}^{(k+1)}+I)\partial_c\otimes I^{(k-1)}\end{aligned}$$

which is the proof of (5.5).

Notice that combining the definition of $\partial_c^{(k)}$ with (5.5) we get

$$(\partial_c\otimes I^{(k-1)})(\mathcal{M}^{(k)} + kI) = (\mathcal{M}^{(k+1)} + (k+1)I)(\partial_c\otimes I^{(k-1)}) \tag{5.6}$$

The next fact is that

$$\langle \mathcal{M}^{(k)}\partial_c^{(k-1)}\phi, \partial_c^{(k-1)}\psi\rangle = k\langle \partial_c^{(k)}\phi, \partial_c^{(k)}\psi\rangle \tag{5.7}$$

This can be proved starting with (5.5) and write it in the form

$$\mathcal{M}^{(k)}(\partial_c\otimes I^{(k-2)}) = (\partial_c\otimes I^{(k-2)})(\mathcal{M}^{(k-1)} - I)$$

which multiplied on the right by $\partial_c^{(k-1)}$ and used iteratively yields

$$\mathcal{M}^{(k)}\partial_c^{(k-1)} = \partial_c^{(k-1)}(\mathcal{M}-k+1)$$

and thus, checking (5.7) becomes now equivalent to

$$\langle \partial_c^{(k-1)}(\mathcal{M}-k+1)\phi, \partial_c^{(k-1)}\psi\rangle = k\langle \partial_c^{(k)}\phi, \partial_c^{(k)}\psi\rangle.$$

It is now sufficient to do this for the case $\phi(z)=\phi_n(z)=z^n$ and $\psi(z)=\psi_m(z)=z^m$ with m,n integer numbers. Since $\mathcal{M}\phi_n=(|n|-1)\phi_n$ and if m and n have different signs, then both sides above are 0. Thus, it suffices to consider the case when both are positive or both are negative. Since the case of negative values is similar, we treat only the case of m,n both positive. In this case the equality to be proved becomes

$$(n-k)\langle \partial_c^{(k-1)}\phi_n, \partial_c^{(k-1)}\psi_n\rangle = k\langle \partial_c^{(k)}\phi_n, \partial_c^{(k)}\psi_n\rangle$$

It is now a straightforward exercise to show by induction that

$$\partial_c^{(k)}\phi_n = \sum_{\substack{i_1+i_2+\cdots+i_{k+1}=n\\ i_1,i_2\ldots,i_{k+1}\geq 1}} z^{i_1}\otimes z^{i_2}\otimes\cdots z^{i_{k+1}}$$

Thus, the equality to be checked becomes

$$(n-k)N_{k-1,n-1}\delta_{n,m} = N_{k,n-1}\delta_{n,m} \tag{5.8}$$

where $N_{k,l}$ is the number of writings of $l=a_1+a_2+\cdots+a_{k+1}$ with $a_1,a_2,\ldots,a_{k+1}\geq 1$. It is very easy to check that $N_{k,l}=\binom{l-1}{k}$ as one can see from equating the coefficients of t^l from the equality

$$\underbrace{(t+t^2+t^3+\ldots)(t+t^2+t^3+\ldots)\ldots(t+t^2+t^3+\ldots)}_{k+1 \text{ times}} = \frac{t^{k+1}}{(1-t)^{k+1}} = \sum_{u\geq k}\binom{u}{k}t^{u+1}.$$

With this the equality (5.8) is veryfied and in turn (5.7) is checked.

Theorem 3. *For any $k\geq 1$ and polynomials ϕ,ψ, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \mathcal{N}\phi,\psi\rangle =& \langle\phi',\psi'\rangle - \frac{1}{2}\langle \partial_c\phi',\partial_c\psi'\rangle_{\alpha^{\otimes 2}} + \cdots + \frac{(-1)^k}{k}\langle \partial_c^{(k-1)}\phi', \partial_c^{(k-1)}\psi'\rangle_{\alpha^{\otimes(k-1)}}\\ &+\frac{(-1)^k}{k}\langle \mathcal{M}^{(k)}(\mathcal{M}^{(k)}+kI)^{-1}\partial_c^{(k-1)}\phi', \partial_c^{(k-1)}\psi'\rangle_{\alpha^{\otimes(k-1)}}.\end{aligned} \tag{5.9}$$

In particular for any $k\geq 1$ we obtain

$$\sum_{l=1}^{2k}\frac{(-1)^{l-1}}{l}\|\partial_c^{(l-1)}\phi'\|^2_{\alpha^{\otimes l}} \leq \langle \mathcal{N}\phi,\phi\rangle \leq \sum_{l=1}^{2k-1}\frac{(-1)^{l-1}}{l}\|\partial_c^{(l-1)}\phi'\|^2_{\alpha^{\otimes l}}.$$

which is a refinement of the free Poincaré inequality for the Haar measure α.

Proof. The proof is an inductions on k, use of the key facts (5.7) and (5.6) combined with the following sequence of equalities

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \mathcal{M}^{(k)}(\mathcal{M}^{(k)}+kI)^{-1}\partial^{(k-1)}\psi, \partial^{(k-1)}\psi\rangle_{\alpha^{\otimes k}} &= \langle \mathcal{M}^{(k)}\partial^{(k-1)}(\mathcal{M}+I)^{-1}\psi, \partial^{(k-1)}\psi\rangle_{\alpha^{\otimes k}}\\ &= k\langle \partial^{(k)}(\mathcal{M}+I)^{-1}\psi, \partial^{(k)}\psi\rangle_{\alpha^{\otimes k}}\\ &= k\langle (\mathcal{M}^{(k+1)}+(k+1)I)^{-1}\partial^{(k)}\psi, \partial^{(k)}\psi\rangle_{\alpha^{\otimes k}}\\ &= \frac{k}{k+1}\langle \partial^{(k)}\psi,\partial^{(k)}\psi\rangle_{\alpha^{\otimes k}} - \frac{k}{k+1}\langle (\mathcal{M}^{(k)}(\mathcal{M}^{(k+1)}+(k+1)I)^{-1}\partial^{(k)}\psi, \partial^{(k)}\psi\rangle_{\alpha^{\otimes k}}.\end{aligned}$$

Notice that the operator $(\mathcal{M}^{(k)}+kI)$ is not invertible on the set of all tensors, but it is so on the set of tensors on the form $\partial_c^{(k-1)}\phi$. □

6. Poincaré's inequality under convexity assumptions

The main result of this section is the following.

Theorem 4. *Assume Q is a C^3 potential on $\mathbf{T}$ such that $Q'' \geq \rho - 1/2$ for some $\rho > 0$. Then for any smooth function ϕ on $\mathbf{T}$,*

$$2\rho \iint \left| \frac{\phi(z) - \phi(w)}{z - w} \right|^2 \alpha(dz)\alpha(dw) \leq \int \left| \phi' - \int \phi' \, d\mu_Q \right|^2 d\mu_Q. \tag{6.1}$$

Proof. The proof starts with (5.1) and the observation that $\mathcal{E}1 = 0$, thus allowing us to write

$$\langle \mathcal{N}\phi, \phi \rangle = \langle \mathcal{E}(\phi' - \int \phi' d\mu_Q), \phi' - \int \phi' d\mu_Q \rangle.$$

Furthermore, since $\mathcal{E} \leq I$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathcal{E}(\phi' - \int \phi' d\mu_Q), \phi' - \int \phi' d\mu_Q \rangle &\leq \langle \phi' - \int \phi' d\mu_Q, \phi' - \int \phi' d\mu_Q \rangle \\ &= \left\langle \frac{1}{1 - \mathcal{N}Q} \left(\phi' - \int \phi' d\mu_Q \right), \phi' - \int \phi' d\mu_Q \right\rangle_{\mu_Q} \\ &= \int \frac{\left| \phi' - \int \phi' \, d\mu_Q \right|^2}{1 - \mathcal{N}Q} d\mu_Q, \end{aligned}$$

where in the middle we used (3.11).

What we need to show now is that $1 - \mathcal{N}Q \geq 2\rho$. To attain this we use Corollary 2, again in conjunction with (3.11). Using $\beta = \rho - \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2\log 2}$ in Corollary 2 and the fact that $\rho > 0$, we obtain that

$$1 - \mathcal{N}Q \geq 2 \log 2 \left(\rho - \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2 \log 2} \right).$$

On the other hand, since $\int Q'' \, d\alpha = 0$ and $Q'' \geq \rho - 1/2$, we learn that $\rho \leq 1/2$. This justifies that

$$2 \log 2 \left(\rho - \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2 \log 2} \right) - 2\rho = 2(\log 2 - 1) \left(\rho - \frac{1}{2} \right) \geq 0$$

which then proves that $1 - \mathcal{N}Q \geq 2\rho$ and this in turn ends the proof. □

We should point that the constant 2ρ in (6.1) can be replaced by the larger quantity $2 \log 2 \left(\rho - \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2 \log 2} \right)$. However in the case of $Q \equiv 0$, which is to say $\rho = 1/2$, both quantities give the same values, namely 1 which is also sharp.

7. The modified Wasserstein Distance

In [12], the free transportation inequality on the circle is deduced as the limiting of the transportation inequalities on orthogonal groups. To recall their main idea, let's denote by $U(n)$ the group of $n \times n$ unitary matrices and for any potential Q on $\mathbf{T}$, let

$$\mathbb{P}_n^Q = \frac{1}{Z_n(Q)} e^{-n \mathrm{Tr} Q(U)} dU,$$

be the reference probability measure on $U(n)$ associated to Q. The classical transportation inequality applied to this reference measure should produce the free transportation inequality. However, to apply the classical inequality one has to take into account that the classical case requires for instance the Bakry-Emery condition. Even in the simplest case, $Q \equiv 0$, the reference measure does not satisfy this condition because the Ricci curvature of $U(n)$ is degenerate. Nevertheless this is saved by the fact that $SU(n)$, the subgroup of unitary matrices of determinant 1 has indeed constant Ricci curvature. It is interesting to point out that the particular structure of $SU(n)$ is actually reflected into the corresponding free Log-Sobolev inequality, while the form of the transportation inequality is in fact the same as in the case of

the real line (with the appropriate quantities well defined). Particularly noticeable here is that the free transportation inequality still uses the standard Wasserstein distance on the circle.

What we show in this note is that the appropriate distance seems to be a little different from the classical one and is morally a reflection of the $SU(n)$ structure versus $U(n)$ structure. The main difference between $U(n)$ and $SU(n)$ is that the latter is a version of the former with an extra constraint. If we look at the measures on $U(n)$ and lift them (using the exponential map) to the Lie algebra of $U(n)$, then, lifts of measures which are supported on $SU(n)$ have to satisfy in principle a constraint. At the heuristic level this is that the integral of the lifted measure must have 0 expectation. This last statement comes from the basic structure of $SU(n)$, namely matrices of determinant 1 and matrices in the Lie algebra $su(n)$ have 0 trace.

Furthermore, the passage from the transportation inequality on $U(n)$ to the free transportation on the circle, involves looking at the distribution of the eigenvalues of the random matrix. According to the above paragraph (at the heuristic level) the lift to the Lie algebra level implies that the lifted measure of the eigenvalues satisfies the extra constraint that the mean of this measure is 0. This is going to be our guiding thought in the following alteration of the definition of the Wasserstein distance.

In the sequel, we denote $\exp : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbf{T}$ the map $\exp(x) = e^{ix}$ and for a given u, we set $\exp_u$ the restriction of $\exp$ to $[u, u + 2\pi)$. Furthermore, for a measure μ on $\mathbf{T}$, we define the lift measure $\bar{\mu}$ by

$$\bar{\mu}(A) = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} \mu(\exp(A \cap [2n\pi, 2(n+1)\pi)).$$

For a measure μ on $\mathbf{T}$, the lift measure $\bar{\mu}_u$ is simply the restriction of $\bar{\mu}$ to the interval $[u, u + 2\pi)$.

Definition 3. *For any two probability measures μ, ν on $\mathbf{T}$, we define for any $p \geq 1$*

$$\mathcal{W}_p(\mu,\nu) = \sup\left\{ W_p(\bar{\mu}_u, \bar{\nu}_v) : u, v \in [0, 2\pi] \text{ such that } \int x\, \bar{\mu}_u(dx) = \int x\, \bar{\nu}_v(dx), \right\}, \tag{7.1}$$

where $W_p(\bar{\mu}_u, \bar{\nu}_v)$ is the standard Wasserstein distance on the real line. We use here the convention that the supremum over the empty set is $+\infty$, thus in principle $\mathcal{W}_p(\mu, \nu)$ can be $+\infty$.

We will denote by $\mathcal{P}_{as}(\mathbf{T})$ the set of atomless probability measures on $\mathbf{T}$.

Here we collect a few properties listed below.

Proposition 5. (1) $\mathcal{W}_p(\mu, \nu) = \mathcal{W}_p(\nu, \mu)$.

(2) *For any probability measures on $\mathbf{T}$*

$$W_p(\mu,\nu) \leq \mathcal{W}_p(\mu,\nu). \tag{7.2}$$

(3) $\mathcal{W}_p(\mu, \nu) = 0$ *if and only if* $\mu = \nu$.

(4) *If $\mu = \delta_a$ and $\nu = \delta_b$, then $\mathcal{W}_p(\delta_a, \delta_b) = \infty$ unless $a = b$.*

(5) *For any $a \in \mathbf{T}$, $\mathcal{W}_p(\delta_a, \alpha) = \left(\frac{2\pi^{p+1}}{p+1}\right)^{1/p}$ for any $p \geq 1$. In particular, for $a, b \in \mathbf{T}$ with $a \neq b$ we have $\mathcal{W}_p(\delta_a, \delta_b) > \mathcal{W}_p(\delta_a, \alpha) + \mathcal{W}_p(\alpha, \delta_b)$. This means that $\mathcal{W}_p$ is not a distance on the set of probability measures.*

(6) *If $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_{as}(\mathbf{T})$, then there exists $t \in [0, 2\pi]$ such that $\int x\, \bar{\mu}_t(dx) = \int x\, \bar{\nu}_t(dx)$. Moreover, for any $u \in [0, 2\pi]$, there exists $v \in [0, 2\pi]$ such that $\int x\, \bar{\mu}_u(dx) = \int x\, \bar{\nu}_v(dx)$.*

If in addition, $u, v \in [0, 2\pi]$ and $u', v' \in [0, 2\pi]$ are two pairs such that $\int x\, \bar{\mu}_u(dx) = \int x\, \bar{\nu}_v(dx)$ and $\int x\, \bar{\mu}_{u'}(dx) = \int x\, \bar{\nu}_{v'}(dx)$, then $W_p(\bar{\mu}_u, \bar{\nu}_v) = W_p(\bar{\mu}_{u'}, \bar{\nu}_{v'})$. In other words, for any $u, v \in [0, 2\pi]$ such that $\int x\, \bar{\mu}_u(dx) = \int x\, \bar{\nu}_v(dx)$ and any $p \geq 1$

$$\mathcal{W}_p(\mu,\nu) = W_p(\bar{\mu}_u, \bar{\nu}_v).$$

In particular, $\mathcal{W}_p(\mu, \nu) < \infty$ and the supremum in the definition of $\mathcal{W}_p(\mu, \nu)$ is attained.

(7) *If μ, ζ, ν are three probability measures in $\mathcal{P}_{as}(\mathbf{T})$, then*

$$\mathcal{W}_2(\mu,\nu) \leq \mathcal{W}_2(\mu,\zeta) + \mathcal{W}_2(\zeta,\nu).$$

(8) *On $\mathcal{P}_{as}(\mathbf{T})$, the topology induced by $\mathcal{W}_2$ is the topology of weak convergence. More precisely, if $\{\mu_n\}_{n\geq 1} \subset \mathcal{P}_{as}(\mathbf{T})$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{as}(\mathbf{T})$, then μ_n converges weakly to μ if and only if $\mathcal{W}_2(\mu_n, \mu)$ converges to 0.*

(9) *For any measure* $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{as}(\mathbf{T})$, $\mathcal{W}_p(\mu, \alpha) = W_p(\mu, \alpha)$.

Proof. (1) It is clear from the definition.

(2) The point is that if we denote by $d(z, w)$ the distance on $\mathbf{T}$, then

$$d(z, w) = \inf_{k,l \in \mathbb{Z}} |x + 2\pi k - (y + 2\pi l)|$$

for any x, y such that $z = e^{ix}$ and $y = e^{iy}$. In particular,

$$d(z, w) \leq |x - y| \tag{7.3}$$

for any any x, y such that $z = e^{ix}$ and $y = e^{iy}$.

Next, for any u, v such that $\int x\bar{\mu}_u(dx) = \int x\bar{\nu}_v(dx)$, and $\bar{\gamma}$ any plan on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ with marginals $\bar{\mu}_u$ and $\bar{\nu}_v$, then $\gamma = (\exp_u \times \exp_v)_{\#}\bar{\gamma}$ is a plan on $\mathbf{T} \times \mathbf{T}$ with marginals μ and ν. Now, using (7.3) shows that for any $u, v \in [0, 2\pi]$ such that $\int x\bar{\mu}_u(dx) = \int x\bar{\nu}_v(dx)$, we get that

$$W_2(\mu, \nu) \leq W_2(\bar{\mu}_u, \bar{\nu}_v)$$

and consequently,

$$W_2(\mu, \nu) \leq \mathcal{W}_2(\mu, \nu)$$

for any μ, ν.

(3) This is clear from the fact that $W_p(\bar{\mu}, \bar{\nu}) = 0$ if and only if $\bar{\mu} = \bar{\nu}$ and (7.2).

(4) For any $u \in [0, 2\pi]$, $\int x\bar{\delta}_{au}(dx) = \bar{a}$ with $\exp_u(\bar{a}) = a$. Similarly, for any $v \in [0, 2\pi]$, we also have $\int x\bar{\delta}_{bv}(dx) = \bar{b}$ with $\exp_v(\bar{b}) = b$. Therefore we need to have $\bar{a} = \bar{b}$ which means that $a = b$ and obviously, $\mathcal{W}_p(\mu, \nu) = 0$. If $a \neq b$, we can not find u, v such that the integral condition is satisfied, thus $\mathcal{W}_p(\delta_a, \delta_b) = +\infty$.

(5) In the first place, for any v, $\bar{\alpha}_v$ is the uniform probability measure on $[v, v + 2\pi)$. We need to find u and v such that $\int x\bar{\delta}_{au}(dx) = \bar{a} = \int x\bar{\alpha}_v(dx) = v + \pi$ from which $v = (\bar{a} - \pi)$ and then $W_p^p(\bar{\delta}_{au}, \bar{\alpha}_v) = \int_v^{v+2\pi} |x - \bar{a}|^p dx = \frac{2\pi^{p+1}}{p+1}$. The rest is trivial.

(6) The key here is the following equation

$$\int x\bar{\mu}_u(dx) = 2\pi\bar{\mu}_0([0, u)) + \int x\bar{\mu}_0(dx), \tag{7.4}$$

which follows from the fact that $\bar{\mu}_u(u + A) = \bar{\mu}_0(A)$ for any $A \subset [0, 2\pi)$. Now, if μ, ν do not have atoms, then we want to find $t \in [0, 2\pi]$ such that

$$\bar{\mu}_0([0, t)) - \bar{\nu}_0([0, t)) = -\frac{1}{2\pi}\left(\int x\bar{\mu}_0(dx) - \int x\bar{\nu}_0(dx)\right) \tag{7.5}$$

Since μ and ν do not have atoms, the function

$$f(t) = \bar{\mu}_0([0, t)) - \bar{\nu}_0([0, t))$$

is a continuous function of t. In addition, a simple argument shows that

$$\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{[0,2\pi)} f(t)dt = -\frac{1}{2\pi}\left(\int x\bar{\mu}_0(dx) - \int x\bar{\nu}_0(dx)\right).$$

Therefore, continuity of f guarantees that there is an intermediate point $t \in [0, 2\pi]$ such that (7.5) is satisfied.

Now, using (7.4), we get that $\int x\,\bar{\mu}_u(dx) = \int x\,\bar{\nu}_v(dx)$ if and only if

$$\bar{\mu}_0([0, u)) - \bar{\nu}_0([0, v)) = -\frac{1}{2\pi}\left(\int x\,\bar{\mu}_0(dx) - \int x\,\bar{\nu}_0(dx)\right). \tag{7.6}$$

Given the solution t to (7.5), the above equation becomes equivalent to

$$\bar{\mu}_0([t, u)) = \bar{\nu}_0([t, v))$$

if $u > t$ and

$$\bar{\mu}_0([u, t)) = \bar{\nu}_0([v, t))$$

if $u \leq t$. Again, since the measures do not have atoms, we deduce that given u, there is at least one v such that (7.6) is satisfied.

Assume now that $u, v \in [0, 2\pi]$ are two values such that $\int x\, \bar{\mu}_u(dx) = \int x\, \bar{\nu}_v(dx)$. There is a non-decreasing transportation map which we denote by $\theta_{u,v}$ which maps $\bar{\mu}_v$ into $\bar{\nu}_v$. This means according to [25, equation (2.49), page 75], that

$$\bar{\mu}_u([u, x)) = \bar{\nu}_v([v, \theta_{u,v}(x))) \tag{7.7}$$

for any $x \in [u, u + 2\pi)$ and

$$W_p^p(\bar{\mu}_u, \bar{\nu}_v) = \int (x - \theta_{u,v}(x))^p\, \bar{\mu}_u(dx).$$

It is clear that $\theta_{u,v} : [u, u + 2\pi) \to [v, v + 2\pi)$.

Next assume that u, v and u', v' are two pairs such that $\int x\, \bar{\mu}_u(dx) = \int x\, \bar{\nu}_v(dx)$ and $\int x\, \bar{\mu}_{u'}(dx) = \int x\, \bar{\nu}_{v'}(dx)$. We may assume for example that $u \leq u'$ and then according to (7.6), we obtain that

$$\bar{\mu}_0([u, u')) = \bar{\nu}_0([v, v'))$$

If $\bar{\mu}_u([u, u')) = 0$, then we also have that $\bar{\nu}_0([v \wedge v', v \vee v')) = 0$ and in this case, if $v' < v$ it is easy to see that $\theta_{u,v}$ also maps $\bar{\mu}_{u'}$ into $\bar{\nu}_{v'}$ and thus $W_2(\bar{\mu}_u, \bar{\nu}_v) = W_2(\bar{\mu}_{u'}, \bar{\nu}_{v'})$. Therefore, without loss of generality we may simply assume that $v \leq v'$. By the definition of $\bar{\mu}_u$, we also obtain that

$$\bar{\mu}_u([u, u')) = \bar{\nu}_v([v, v')). \tag{7.8}$$

Let F_u be the cumulative function of $\bar{\mu}_u$ and G_v the cumulative function of $\bar{\nu}_v$. Similarly denote by $F_{u'}$ and $G_{v'}$ the cumulative functions of $\bar{\mu}_{u'}$ and $\bar{\nu}_{v'}$. Now, (7.8) reads as

$$F_u(u') = G_v(v') \tag{7.9}$$

Also, from [25, Section 2.2] and with the notations from there, we know that

$$\theta_{u,v} = G_v^{-1} \circ F_u \tag{7.10}$$

where G^{-1} is the generalized inverse of G. The main point in the proof now is the following relation

$$F_{u'}(x) = \begin{cases} F_u(x) - F_u(u') & u' \leq x < u + 2\pi \\ F_u(x - 2\pi) + 1 - F_u(u') & u + 2\pi \leq x < u' + 2\pi. \end{cases} \tag{7.11}$$

To see why this is so, we just need to observe that $F_{u'}(x) = \bar{\mu}_{u'}([u', x)) = \bar{\mu}_u([u, x)) - \bar{\mu}_u([u, u'))$ for $u' \leq x < u + 2\pi$ and $\bar{\mu}_{u'}([u', x)) = \bar{\mu}([u', u + 2\pi)) + \bar{\mu}([u + 2\pi, x)) = 1 - F_u(u') + \bar{\mu}([u, x - 2\pi))$.

Using the similar writing for G_v and $G_{v'}$ it is now a simple exercise to show that

$$G_{v'}^{-1}(y) = \begin{cases} G_v^{-1}(y + G_v(v')) & 0 \leq y < G_v(v') \\ G_v^{-1}(y - 1 + G_v(v')) + 2\pi & G_v(v') \leq y < 1. \end{cases} \tag{7.12}$$

Combing (7.9), (7.10), (7.11) and (7.12) we obtain

$$\theta_{u',v'}(x) = \begin{cases} \theta_{u,v}(x) & u' \leq x < u + 2\pi \\ \theta_{u,v}(x - 2\pi) + 2\pi & u + 2\pi \leq x < u' + 2\pi. \end{cases} \tag{7.13}$$

Once this is obtained, a simple check reveals that

$$W_p^p(\bar{\mu}_u, \bar{\nu}_v) = \int_{[u,u+2\pi)} (x - \theta_{u,v}(x))^p \bar{\mu}(dx) = \int_{[u',u'+2\pi)} (x - \theta_{u',v'}(x))^p \bar{\mu}(dx) = W_p^p(\bar{\mu}_{u'}, \bar{\nu}_{v'}),$$

which is what we wanted to show. The rest is obvious.

(7) Take u, v, t such that $\int x\, \bar{\mu}_u(dx) = \int x\, \bar{\zeta}_t(dx)$ and for this fixed t choose v such that $\int x\, \bar{\zeta}_t(dx) = \int x\, \bar{\nu}_v(dx)$ which is always possible as we pointed out above. Then, the rest follows from the fact that $\int x\, \bar{\mu}_u(dx) = \int x\, \bar{\nu}_v(dx)$ and according to the previous item,

$$\mathcal{W}_p(\mu, \nu) = W_p(\bar{\mu}_u, \bar{\nu}_v) \leq W_p(\bar{\mu}_u, \bar{\zeta}_t) + W_p(\bar{\zeta}_t, \bar{\nu}_v) = \mathcal{W}_p(\mu, \zeta) + \mathcal{W}_p(\zeta, \nu).$$

(8) Choose sequences u_n, v_n such that (7.6) is satisfied with u_n and v_n in place of u and v and such that $W_p(\bar{\mu}_{u_n}, \bar{\nu}_{v_n})$ converges to $\mathcal{W}_p(\mu,\nu)$. Eventually, passing to subsequences, we may assume that $u_n \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} u$ and $v_n \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} v$. Then, because the measures do not have atoms, (7.6) is still satisfied with these u and v. In addition, again, because there are no atoms, it is clear that $\bar{\mu}_{u_n}$ converges weakly to $\bar{\mu}_u$ and similarly $\bar{\nu}_{v_n}$ converges weakly to $\bar{\nu}_{v_n}$. Since W_p is a metric for the weak topology on probabilities on $\mathbf{T}$, it follows that μ_u, ν_v are actually attaining the supremum/infimum in the definition of $\mathcal{W}_p(\mu,\nu)$.

(9) Assume u, v are such that $\int x\bar{\mu}_u(dx) = \int x\bar{\alpha}_u(dx)$. In fact, because α is the Haar measure on $\mathbf{T}$, we certainly have $\int x\bar{\alpha}_u(dx) = u+\pi$. Now if we take the transport map θ which maps $\bar{\alpha}_u$ into $\bar{\mu}_u$, we claim that $|\theta(x)-x| \le \pi$. Indeed, if this were not so, then we would have z, say for simplicity, $z \in [u, u+\pi)$ such that $\theta(z) > z+\pi$. Since θ is non-decreasing, we also get that $\theta(y) \ge z+\pi$ for all $y \in [z, u+2\pi)$. On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} 2\pi(u+\pi) &= \int_u^{u+2\pi} \theta(x)dx = \int_u^z \theta(x)dx + \int_z^{u+2\pi} \theta(x)dx \\ &\ge \int_u^z u dx + \int_z^{u+2\pi} (z+\pi)dx = u(z-u) + (z+\pi)(u+2\pi-z) \end{aligned}$$

which leads to $z \ge u+\pi$ which is exactly the contrary of what we assumed. A similar argument can be run to prove that we can not have $z \ge u+\pi$ such that $|\theta(z)-z| > \pi$. Since the map θ is such that $|\theta(x)-x| \le \pi$, it means that the segment on the circle between x and $\theta(x)$ is a geodesic segment and such θ is the transportation map for $W_2(\mu,\nu)$ on the circle. □

As in the classical case there is a dual formulation of the distance $\mathcal{W}_2$ which is given below.

Theorem 5. (1) *Given $p \ge 1$ and two measures $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{T})$, we have*

$$\mathcal{W}_p^p(\mu,\nu) = \sup_{(\lambda,f,g)} \left\{ \int f\, d\mu + \int g\, d\nu : f(x)+g(y) \le |x-y|^p + \lambda(x-y),\ \forall x,y \in \mathbb{R} \right\} \tag{7.14}$$

where the supremum is taken over all triples (λ, f, g) with $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and $f, g : \mathbf{T} \to \mathbb{R}$ continuous functions (identified as periodic continuous functions on $\mathbb{R}$).

(2) *Assume that $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and f is a continuous bounded function on the real line. Define now*

$$(\mathcal{U}_t^\lambda f)(x) = \inf_{y\in\mathbb{R}} \left\{ f(y) + \frac{(x-y)^2}{t} + \lambda(x-y) \right\}.$$

Then, $f_t(x) = (\mathcal{U}_t^\lambda f)(x)$ satisfies

$$\partial_t f_t = -\frac{(f_t' - \lambda)^2}{4} \text{ with } f_0 = f.$$

In addition, if f is a periodic functions, then $\mathcal{U}_t^\lambda f$ is also a periodic function.

(3) *We have for any measures $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{T})$,*

$$\mathcal{W}_2^2(\mu,\nu) = \sup_{(\lambda,f)} \left\{ \int \mathcal{U}_1^\lambda f\, d\mu - \int f\, d\nu \right\}.$$

where the supremum is taken over all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and periodic smooth functions f.

(4) *For $p = 1$ the following characterization holds:*

$$\mathcal{W}_1(\mu,\nu) = \sup_{\lambda,f} \left\{ \int f\, d(\mu-\nu) : |f(x)-f(y)-\lambda(x-y)| \le |x-y| \right\} \tag{7.15}$$

where the supremum is taken over all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and continuous periodic f.

Proof. (1) Observe first that for any u, v and periodic functions $f, g : \mathbf{T} \to \mathbb{R}$,

$$\int f\, d\mu + \int g\, d\nu = \int (f(x)-\lambda x)\bar{\mu}_u(dx) + \int (g(x)+\lambda x)\bar{\nu}_v(dx) + \lambda\left(\int x\bar{\mu}_u(dx) - \int x\bar{\nu}_v(dx) \right)$$

for any choice of λ.

On the other hand, the duality for the standard Wasserstein distance is written as

$$W_p^p(\bar{\mu}_u, \bar{\nu}_v) = \sup_{h,k} \left\{ \int h \, d\bar{\mu}_u + \int k \, d\bar{\nu}_v : h(x) + k(y) \leq |x-y|^p \right\}.$$

This means that for any u, v and functions f, g satisfying $f(x) + g(y) \leq |x-y|^p + \lambda(x-y)$, the functions $h(x) = f(x) - \lambda x$ and $k(x) = g(x) + \lambda x$ satisfy $h(x) + k(y) \leq |x-y|^p$, thus,

$$\int f \, d\mu + \int g \, d\nu \leq W_p^p(\bar{\mu}_u, \bar{\nu}_v) + \lambda \left(\int x \bar{\mu}_u(dx) - \int x \bar{\nu}_v(dx) \right)$$

Therefore, if u, v are such that $\int x \, \bar{\mu}_u(dx) - \int x \, \bar{\nu}_v(dx) = 0$ we obtain that

$$\mathcal{W}_p^p(\mu, \nu) \geq \sup_{(\lambda,f,g)} \left\{ \int f \, d\mu + \int g \, d\nu : f(x) + g(y) \leq |x-y|^p + \lambda(x-y), \, \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R} \right\}.$$

This still holds if there are no u, v such that $\int x \, \bar{\mu}_u(dx) = \int x \, \bar{\nu}_v(dx)$ because in this case, $\mathcal{W}_p(\mu, \nu) = +\infty$. Thus we need to prove the reverse inequality.

We first observe that for any u, v we have a transport map, say θ transporting $\bar{\mu}_u$ into $\bar{\nu}_v$ and such that $\theta : [u, u+2\pi) \to [v, v+2\pi)$. Now for any given function $g : [v, v+2\pi) \to \mathbb{R}$ we can define $f(x) = |\theta(x) - x|^p - g(\theta(x)) + \lambda(\theta(x) - x)$. With this choice we obviously have,

$$\int (f(x) - \lambda x) \, \bar{\mu}_u(dx) + \int (g(x) + \lambda x) \, \bar{\nu}_v(dx) = \int |\theta(x) - x|^p \bar{\mu}_u(dx) = W_p^p(\bar{\mu}_u, \bar{\nu}_v).$$

Given this we simply notice that if we extend g and θ by periodicity (to periodic functions of period 2π) and define $f(x) = |\theta(x) - x|^p - g(\theta(x)) + \lambda(\theta(x) - x)$, it is clear that f is also periodic of period 2π. The conclusion is that for any given u, v, we can find periodic functions, f and g such that $f(x) + g(y) \leq |x-y|^p + \lambda(x-y)$ and

$$\int f \, d\mu + \int g \, d\nu = W_p^p(\bar{\mu}_u, \bar{\nu}_v) + \lambda \left(\int x \bar{\mu}_u(dx) - \int x \bar{\nu}_v(dx) \right).$$

Now, if for any choice of u and v, $\int x \bar{\mu}_u(dx) \neq \int x \bar{\nu}_v(dx)$, then

$$\sup_{(\lambda,f,g)} \left\{ \int f \, d\mu + \int g \, d\nu : f(x) + g(y) \leq |x-y|^p + \lambda(x-y), \, \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R} \right\} = +\infty = \mathcal{W}_p^p(\mu, \nu).$$

In the case there exist u, v such that $\int x \bar{\mu}_u(dx) = \int x \bar{\nu}_v(dx)$, we get that

$$\sup_{(\lambda,f,g)} \left\{ \int f \, d\mu + \int g \, d\nu : f(x) + g(y) \leq |x-y|^p + \lambda(x-y), \, \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R} \right\} \geq \mathcal{W}_p^p(\bar{\mu}_u, \bar{\nu}_v).$$

Taking the supremum over all such choices of u, v we obtain that

$$\sup_{(\lambda,f,g)} \left\{ \int f \, d\mu + \int g \, d\nu : f(x) + g(y) \leq |x-y|^p + \lambda(x-y), \, \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R} \right\} \geq \mathcal{W}_p^p(\mu, \nu)$$

and thus we finish the argument.

(2) Set

$$(U_t f)(x) = \inf \left\{ f(y) + \frac{(x-y)^2}{t} \right\}.$$

This is known as the infimum convolution semigroup and satisfies for $\tilde{f}_t = U_t f$,

$$\partial_t \tilde{f} = -\frac{1}{4} (\tilde{f}_t')^2 \text{ with } \tilde{f}_0(x) = f(x)$$

On the other hand, it is a simple exercise to check that

$$(\mathcal{U}_t^\lambda f)(x) = \lambda x + (U_t f_\lambda)(x) \text{ with } f_\lambda(x) = f(x) - \lambda x.$$

and the rest follows trivially.

(3) We just have to observe that for a given function f, the best function g such that $g(x) - f(y) \leq (x-y)^2 + \lambda(x-y)$ is given by $g = \mathcal{U}_1^\lambda f$.

From

$$W_1(\mu,\nu) = \sup_{\lambda,f,g}\left\{\int f d\mu - \int g d\nu : f(x) \leq g(y) + |x-y| + \lambda(x-y)\right\}.$$

For a fixed λ, and a fixed function g, the best choice of f is $f(x) = \inf_y\{g(y) + |x-y| + \lambda(x-y)\}$. In particular, $f(x) \leq g(x)$ and

$$\int f d\mu - \int g d\nu \leq \int f d(\mu - \nu)$$

Denoting now $f(x) = \inf_y\{g(y) + |x-y| + \lambda(x-y)\}$, we have that for every $\epsilon > 0$, we can find a y_ϵ such that

$$f(x) - f(x') \leq \epsilon + g(y_\epsilon) + |x - y_\epsilon| + \lambda(x - y_\epsilon) - (g(y_\epsilon) + |x' - y_\epsilon| + \lambda(x' - y_\epsilon)) \leq \epsilon + |x - x'| + \lambda(x - x').$$

Therefore we get that

$$|f(x) - f(x') + \lambda(x - x')| \leq |x - x'| \text{ for all } x, x'.$$

Hence,

$$W_1(\mu,\nu) \leq \sup_{\lambda,f}\left\{\int f\, d(\mu-\nu) : |f(x) - f(y) - \lambda(x-y)| \leq |x-y|\right\}.$$

On the other hand, if f is as above (namely $|f(x) - f(y) - \lambda(x-y)| \leq |x-y|$), take $g(x) = \inf_y\{f(y) + |x-y| + \lambda(x-y)\}$ and observe now that $f(x) = g(x)$, and moreover $f(x) - g(y) \leq |x-y| + \lambda(x-y)$, from which

$$\int f d\mu - \int f d\nu = \int f d\mu - \int g d\nu.$$

This is now enough to conclude that

$$W_1(\mu,\nu) \geq \sup_{\lambda,f}\left\{\int f\, d(\mu-\nu) : |f(x) - f(y) - \lambda(x-y)| \leq |x-y|\right\}.$$

and thus we are done. □

8. Transportation, Log-Sobolev and HWI inequalities

8.1. **Transportation Inequality.** In this section we discuss the transportation inequality. The approach is based on the ideas from [16] and [20].

Definition 4. *For a potential Q on $\mathbf{T}$, we say that it satisfies the transportation inequality if there is a positive $\rho > 0$, such that for any other smooth measure μ on $\mathbf{T}$,*

$$\rho \mathcal{W}_2^2(\mu, \mu_Q) \leq E_Q(\mu) - E_Q(\mu_Q) \tag{8.1}$$

where $\mathcal{W}_2(\mu,\nu)$ is the distance defined in (7.1).

We refer to (8.1) as $T(\rho)$.

Theorem 6. *Any C^3 potential $Q : \mathbf{T} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $Q'' \geq \rho - 1/2$ for some $\rho > 0$ satisfies $T(\rho/2)$.*

Proof. For any probability measure μ on $\mathbf{T}$ with finite energy $E_Q(\mu)$, it is clear that μ does not have atoms. Thus according to (6) in Proposition 5 we can choose t and $\theta = \theta_t : [t, t+2\pi) \to [t, t+2\pi)$ such that θ is non-decreasing and

$$\mathcal{W}_2^2(\mu,\mu_Q) = W_2^2(\bar\mu_t, \bar\mu_{Q,t}) = \int (x - \theta(x))^2 \bar\mu_{Q,t}(dx).$$

The transportation inequality becomes now (recall that $V(x) = Q(e^{ix})$)

$$\frac{\rho}{2}\int (\theta(x)-x)^2 \bar\mu_{Q,t}(dx) \leq \int (V(\theta(x)) - V(x))\bar\mu_{Q,t}(dx) - \iint \log\left(\frac{\sin((\theta(x)-\theta(y))/2)}{\sin((x-y)/2)}\right)\bar\mu_{Q,t}(dx)\bar\mu_{Q,t}(dy).$$

Since $V''(x) = Q''(e^{ix}) \geq (\rho - 1/2)$ for $x \in [t, t+2\pi)$ we get that

$$V(\theta(x)) - V(x) \geq V'(x)(\theta(x) - x) + (\rho/2 - 1/4)(\theta(x) - x)^2$$

and thus it suffices to prove that

(8.2)
$$\frac{1}{4}\int(\theta(x)-x)^2\bar{\mu}_{Q,t}(dx)\leq\int V'(x)(\theta(x)-x)\bar{\mu}_{Q,t}(dx)-\iint\log\left(\frac{\sin((\theta(x)-\theta(y))/2)}{\sin((x-y)/2)}\right)\bar{\mu}_{Q,t}(dx)\bar{\mu}_{Q,t}(dy).$$

At this point we can use the variational characterization of the minimizer μ_Q to justify that

$$V'(x)=\frac{d}{dx}2\int\log|\sin((x-y)/2)|\bar{\mu}_Q(dx)=\int\cot((x-y)/2)\bar{\mu}_Q(dx)$$

for x in $[t,t+2\pi)$. By Corollary 2 we know that the support of $\mu_{Q,t}$ is the whole interval $[t,t+2\pi)$ and the last integral above has to be taken as a principal value integral. From here, and the fact that the means of both $\mu_{Q,t}$ and μ_t are equal, we obtain the following identities

$$\int(\theta(x)-x)^2\bar{\mu}_{Q,t}(dx)=\frac{1}{2}\iint((\theta(x)-x)-(\theta(y)-y))^2\bar{\mu}_{Q,t}(dx)\bar{\mu}_{Q,t}(dy)$$
$$\int V'(x)(\theta(x)-x)\bar{\mu}_{Q,t}(dx)=\frac{1}{2}\iint((\theta(x)-x)-(\theta(y)-y))\cot((x-y)/2)\bar{\mu}_{Q,t}(dx)\bar{\mu}_{Q,t}(dy).$$

Further, since $\frac{1}{2}x^2+\log(\sin(x))$ is concave on $[0,\pi)$, we have that for $a,b\in[0,\pi)$

$$\frac{1}{2}(a-b)^2\leq(a-b)\cot(b)-\log\left(\frac{\sin(a)}{\sin(b)}\right)\tag{8.3}$$

and this with $a=(\theta(x)-\theta(y))/2$, $b=(x-y)/2$, $x>y$, completes the proof. □

In the case of measures on the real line, the transport inequalities from [16] for some cases proved to be sharp. In the present context the above proof does not give the sharp constants as it is proved in the following.

Proposition 6. *For the case of $Q\equiv 0$, $\rho=1/2$, there exists $\epsilon>0$ such that $T((1+\epsilon)/4)$ holds true. Thus $T(1/4)$ from the above theorem is not sharp.*

Proof. For the case of $Q\equiv 0$, $\rho=1/2$ and $\mu_Q=\alpha$. In order to get a sharp inequality, we need to saturate (8.3) and that is the case for either a close to b or b close to $\pi/2$.

An improvement of the inequality (8.3) would be of the form

$$\frac{(a-b)^2h(b)}{2}\leq(a-b)\cot(b)-\log\left(\frac{\sin(a)}{\sin(b)}\right)\tag{8.4}$$

for some function $h(b)$. Clearly, (8.3) gives that we can take $h(b)=1$ for any b. The idea is that replacing $a=(\theta(x)-\theta(y))/2$, $b=(x-y)/2$, $x>y$ and integrating with respect to x and y, we obtain that

$$\frac{1}{8}\int(\psi(x)-\psi(y))^2h(|x-y|/2)\,dx\,dy\leq-\iint\log\left(\frac{\sin((\theta(x)-\theta(y))/2)}{\sin((x-y)/2)}\right)dx\,dy\tag{8.5}$$

with the notation $\psi(x)=\theta(x)-x$.

The best choice in (8.4) is the following function

$$h(b)=\inf_{a\in[0,\pi]}\frac{2\left((a-b)\cot(b)-\log\left(\frac{\sin(a)}{\sin(b)}\right)\right)}{(a-b)^2}.\tag{8.6}$$

Thus, we try to prove an inequality of the form

$$c\int\psi^2(x)\,dx\leq\int(\psi(x)-\psi(y))^2h(|x-y|/2)\,dx\,dy.\tag{8.7}$$

Notice that we clearly have $h(b)\geq 1$ and thus the above inequality holds with $c=2$ which yields $T(1/4)$. Nevertheless, the point is that the above inequality may give a better constant than $c=2$.

To understand the function h, notice that from the Taylor's formula with the the integral remainder, we learn that

$$\left((a-b)\cot(b)-\log\left(\frac{\sin(a)}{\sin(b)}\right)\right)=(a-b)^2\int_0^1\frac{1-s}{\sin^2(b+s(a-b))}ds$$

so

$$h(b) = \inf_{a\in[0,\pi]} \int_0^1 \frac{2(1-s)}{\sin^2(b+s(a-b))} ds.$$

It is clear from this representation that h is a continuous function on $(0,\pi)$ and in addition to this, $h(b) \geq 1$ with equality only for the case of $b = \pi/2$. Moreover $h(0) = h(\pi) = +\infty$. Therefore, we can take a continuous function $g : [-\pi,\pi] \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $g(b) = g(-b)$, $h(b) \geq g(b)$ and $g(b) \geq 1$ with equality only for $b = \pm\pi/2$.

With this choice we claim that there is a constant $\delta > 0$ such that for any continuous function ψ with $\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \psi(x)dx = 0$ and

$$2(1+\delta) \int \psi^2(x)\, dx \leq \int (\psi(x) - \psi(y))^2 g(|x-y|/2)\, dx\, dy \tag{8.8}$$

which in turn will imply that the constant c in (8.7) satisfies $c > 2$, thus combining this with (8.5) we obtain that the transportation inequality is $T(c/8)$ with $c/8 > 1/4$.

To see why (8.8) is fulfilled, we follow an argument suggested to the author by Michael Loss. It is easy to see first that $g(|x-y|/2) = g((x-y)/2) = \sum_n e^{-in(x-y)/2}\hat{g}(n)$ where $\hat{g}(n) = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} g(x)\cos(nx)dx$. Now after some elementary manipulations with Fourier series, the above inequality translates into

$$(1+\delta)\sum_{n\neq 0} |\hat{\psi}(n)|^2 \leq \sum_n |\hat{\psi}(n)|^2(\hat{g}(0) - \hat{g}(n))$$

which follows once we prove that for some δ and any $n \geq 0$,

$$1 + \delta \leq \hat{g}(0) - \hat{g}(n) = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} (1-\cos(nx))g(x)dx.$$

In the first place, for any finite number of values of n, it is clear that

$$1 = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{-\pi}^{\pi}(1-\cos(nx))dx < \frac{1}{\pi}\int_0^{\pi}(1-\cos(nx))g(x)dx.$$

on the other hand, for large n,

$$\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{-\pi}^{\pi}(1-\cos(nx))g(x)dx = \frac{1}{\pi}\int_0^{\pi}(1-\cos(nx))g(x)dx = \int_0^{\pi}(1-\cos(y))\frac{1}{n\pi}\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} g\left(\frac{k\pi+y}{n}\right)dy$$

which converges as $n \to \infty$ to

$$\frac{1}{\pi}\int_0^1 g(t\pi)dt = \frac{1}{\pi}\int_0^{\pi} g(s)ds > 1.$$

Consequently, we can choose a small $\delta > 0$ such that for any n,

$$1 + \delta \leq \hat{g}(0) - \hat{g}(n) = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} (1-\cos(nx))g(x)dx.$$

which ends the proof. □

Conjecture 1. *For $Q \equiv 0$, $T(1/2)$ holds true.*

Here is some supporting evidence for this claim. If we consider $h(y) = 1/\sin^2(y)$, then the left hand side of (8.5) above becomes

$$\frac{1}{8}\int (\psi(x)-\psi(y))^2 h(|x-y|)\, dx\, dy = \frac{1}{8}\int \frac{(\psi(x)-\psi(y))^2}{\sin^2((x-y)/2)}\, dx\, dy = \frac{1}{2}\int \frac{(\phi(z)-\phi(w))^2}{|z-w|^2}\alpha(dz)\alpha(dw)$$

where $\phi(e^{ix}) = \psi(x)$. The last term is precisely $\langle \mathcal{N}\phi, \phi\rangle$ and because $\int \phi\, d\alpha = 0$, we know from the fact that the spectrum of $\mathcal{N}$ is $0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \ldots$, that $\langle \mathcal{N}\phi,\phi\rangle \geq \int \phi^2\, d\alpha$ and thus

$$\frac{1}{2}\int \psi^2(x)\, dx \leq \frac{1}{8}\int (\psi(x)-\psi(y))^2 h(|x-y|)\, dx\, dy$$

and if (8.4) were true with $h(b)=1/\sin^2(b)$, then we would obtain that

$$\frac{1}{2}\int(\theta(x)-x)^2(x)dx\leq-\iint\log\left(\frac{\sin((\theta(x)-\theta(y))/2)}{\sin((x-y)/2)}\right)\,dx\,dy$$

which is in fact $T(1/2)$, thus getting the claim of the Conjecture.

Unfortunately, (8.4) is not satisfied with $h(b)=1/\sin^2(b)$, thus the argument outlined above does not work. However, it might be that the operator defined by the Dirichlet form of the left hand side of (8.5) with the function h from (8.6) might have the same spectral gap as the operator $\mathcal{N}$, though, I do not know how to show that.

8.2. **Log-Sobolev Inequality.** In this section we focus on the following form of Log-Sobolev inequality.

Definition 5. *We say that the potential Q satisfies the free Log-Sobolev if there exists a positive $\rho>0$ such that for any other smooth measure μ on* $\mathbf{T}$

$$E_Q(\mu)-E_Q(\mu_Q)\leq\frac{1}{4\rho}I_Q(\mu) \tag{8.9}$$

with

$$I_Q(\mu):=\int(H\mu-Q')^2d\mu-\left(\int Q'd\mu\right)^2\text{ and }H\mu(x)=-p.v.\int\frac{z+w}{z-w}\mu(dw)=p.v.\int\cot\left(\frac{x-y}{2}\right)\bar{\mu}_u(dy).$$

taken in the sense of principal value and for any $u\in[0,2\pi)$.

We will refer in the sequel to (8.9) as $LSI(\rho)$.

Notice that because $\int(H\mu)d\mu=0$, it follows easily that $I_Q(\mu)\geq 0$ with equality for $\mu=\mu_Q$.

The main result of this section is essentially due to Hiai and Petz from [12], though they use there random matrices, our proof is entirely different.

Theorem 7. *Any C^3 potential $Q:\mathbf{T}\to\mathbb{R}$ such that $Q''\geq\rho-1/2$ for some $\rho>0$ satisfies $LSI(\rho/2)$.*

Proof. We proceed as in the proof of the transportation inequality with the same notations as in there. Thus the map θ transports $\bar{\mu}_{Q,t}$ into $\bar{\mu}_t$ and with this we write the inequality in the equivalent form as

$$\iint\log\left(\frac{\sin((x-y)/2)}{\sin((\theta(x)-\theta(y))/2)}\right)\bar{\mu}_{Q,t}(dx)\bar{\mu}_{Q,t}(dy)\leq\int(V(x)-V(T(x)))\bar{\mu}_{Q,t}(dx)$$
$$+\frac{1}{2\rho}\int(H\mu(\theta(x))-V'(\theta(x)))^2\bar{\mu}_{Q,t}(dx)-\frac{1}{2\rho}\left(\int V'(\theta(x))\bar{\mu}_{Q,t}(dx)\right)^2.$$

Since $V(x)-(\rho/2-1/4)x^2$ is convex,

$$V(x)-V(T(x))\geq(\rho-1/2)(x-T(x))^2/2+(x-T(x))V'(T(x))$$

and then

$$V(x)-V(T(x))+\frac{1}{2\rho}(H\mu(T(x))-V'(T(x)))^2\geq$$
$$\frac{2\rho-1}{4}(T(x)-x)^2+(x-T(x))V'(T(x))+\frac{1}{2\rho}(H\mu(T(x))-V'(T(x)))^2$$
$$=-(1/4)(T(x)-x)^2+(x-T(x))H\mu(T(x))+\frac{1}{2\rho}\left[\rho(x-T(x))+V'(T(x))-H\mu(T(x))\right]^2$$

Integrating with respect to $\bar{\mu}_{Q,t}$, using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the fact that

$$\int(x-T(x))\bar{\mu}_{Q,t}(dx)=\int H\mu(T(x))\bar{\mu}_{Q,t}(dx)=0,$$

results with

$$\int\frac{1}{2\rho}\left[\rho(x-T(x))+V'(T(x))-H\mu(T(x))\right]^2\mu_Q(dx)\geq\int\left(V'(T(x))\mu_Q(dx)\right)^2.$$

The required inequality reduces thus to

(8.10)
$$\iint \log\left(\frac{\sin((x-y)/2)}{\sin((T(x)-T(y))/2)}\right)\bar{\mu}_{Q,t}(dx)\bar{\mu}_{Q,t}(dy) \leq -(1/4)\int (T(x)-x)^2\bar{\mu}_{Q,t}(dx)+\int (x-T(x))H\mu(T(x))\bar{\mu}_{Q,t}(dx).$$

Furthermore, since

$$\int (T(x)-x)^2\bar{\mu}_{Q,t}(dx) = \frac{1}{2}\iint ((T(x)-x)-(T(y)-y))^2\bar{\mu}_{Q,t}(dx)\bar{\mu}_{Q,t}(dy)$$
$$\int (x-T(x))H\mu(T(x))\bar{\mu}_{Q,t}(dx) = \frac{1}{2}\iint ((x-T(x))-(y-T(y)))\cot((T(x)-T(y))/2)\bar{\mu}_{Q,t}(dx)\bar{\mu}_{Q,t}(dy)$$

the rest follows from (8.3) with $a=(x-y)/2$ and $b=(T(x)-T(y))/2$. □

As in the case of the transportation, we do not think $LSI(\rho/2)$ is sharp. In particular, for $Q\equiv 0$, we can prove as in the case of the transportation the following statement.

Proposition 7. *For the case $Q\equiv 0$, there exists $\delta>0$ such that $LSI((1+\delta)/4)$ is satisfied.*

The proof is very similar to the one used in the transportation and thus we do not show it here.

As in the transportation inequality case, we believe that for the case of $Q\equiv 0$, the constant in Theorem 7 is $1/2$ not $1/4$.

Conjecture 2. *For the case $Q\equiv 0$, $LSI(1/2)$ is true.*

8.3. **HWI inequality.**

Definition 6. *We say that the potential Q satisfies the free $HWI(\rho)$ for $\rho\in\mathbb{R}$ if for any smooth measure μ on $\mathbf{T}$*

$$E_Q(\mu)-E_Q(\mu_Q) \leq \sqrt{I_Q(\mu)}\mathcal{W}_2(\mu,\mu_Q)-\rho\mathcal{W}_2(\mu,\mu_Q)^2. \tag{8.11}$$

With the same notations as above we have the following result.

Theorem 8. *Any C^3 potential $Q:\mathbf{T}\to\mathbb{R}$ such that $Q''\geq(\rho-1/2)$ for some $\rho\in\mathbb{R}$ satisfies the free $HWI(\rho/2)$.*

Proof. We use the same notations as in the proof of the transportation inequality.

After some elementary rearrangements, we need to prove that

$$\begin{aligned}\iint \log\left(\frac{\sin((x-y)/2)}{\sin((\theta(x)-\theta(y))/2)}\right)\bar{\mu}_{Q,t}(dx)\bar{\mu}_{Q,t}(dy) &\leq \int (V(x)-V(\theta(x)))\bar{\mu}_{Q,t}(dx)\\ &+\left(\int (x-\theta(x))^2\bar{\mu}_{Q,t}(dx)\right)\left(\int (H\mu(\theta(x))-V'(\theta(x)))^2\bar{\mu}_{Q,t}(dx)-\left(\int V'(\theta(x))\bar{\mu}_{Q,t}(dx)\right)^2\right)^{1/2}\\ &-\frac{\rho}{2}\int (x-\theta(x))^2\bar{\mu}_{Q,t}(dx).\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$V(x)-V(\theta(x)) \geq (\rho/2-1/4)(x-\theta(x))^2+(x-\theta(x))V'(\theta(x)),$$

and (8.10), we are left with showing that

$$\begin{aligned}\int (x-\theta(x))(H\mu(\theta(x))-V'(\theta(x))\bar{\mu}_{Q,t}(dx) \leq &\left(\int (x-\theta(x))^2\bar{\mu}_{Q,t}(dx)\right)\times\\ &\left(\int (H\mu(\theta(x))-V'(\theta(x)))^2\bar{\mu}_{Q,t}(dx)-\left(\int V'(\theta(x))\bar{\mu}_{Q,t}(dx)\right)^2\right)^{1/2}.\end{aligned}$$

Let $f(x)=x-\theta(x)$, $g(x)=H\mu(\theta(x))-V'(x)$ and $h(x)=-V'(x)$. Then we have that $\int f(x)\bar{\mu}_{Q,t}(dx)=0$, $\int g(x)\bar{\mu}_{Q,t}(dx)=\int h(x)\bar{\mu}_{Q,t}(dx)$, and the rest follows from

$$\begin{aligned}\int f(x)g(x)\bar{\mu}_{Q,t}(dx)&=\int f(x)\left(g(x)-\int h(y)\bar{\mu}_{Q,t}(dy)\right)\bar{\mu}_{Q,t}(dx)\\&\leq\left(\int f^2(x)\bar{\mu}_{Q,t}(dx)\right)^{1/2}\left(\int\left(g(x)-\int h(y)\bar{\mu}_{Q,t}(dy)\right)^2\right)^{1/2}\\&=\left(\int f^2(x)\bar{\mu}_{Q,t}(dx)\right)^{1/2}\left(\int g^2(x)\bar{\mu}_{Q,t}(dx)-\left(\int h(y)\bar{\mu}_{Q,t}(dy)\right)^2\right)^{1/2}.\end{aligned}$$ □

Remark 1. *As in the case of Log-Sobolev inequality and transportation, for $Q\equiv 0$, the $HWI(1/4)$ is probably not sharp. We conjecture as well that the sharp inequality is $HWI(1/2)$, but we do not have a proof.*

8.4. **Brunn-Minkowski inequality.** The content of this section is the following.

Theorem 9. *Assume that Q_1,Q_2,Q_3 are continuous potentials on $\mathbf{T}$ such that for some $a\in(0,1)$,*

$$aQ_1(e^{ix})+(1-a)Q_2(e^{iy})\geq Q_3(e^{i(ax+(1-a)y)})\quad\textit{for all}\quad x,y\in\mathbb{R},\tag{8.12}$$

Then

$$aE_{Q_1}(\mu_{Q_1})+(1-a)E_{Q_2}(\mu_{Q_2})\geq E_{Q_3}(\mu_{Q_3}).\tag{8.13}$$

Proof. Map all measures onto $[0,2\pi)$ and then take the (non-decreasing) transportation map θ from μ_{V_1} into μ_{V_2}. The existence of θ is guaranteed by the fact that μ_{Q_1} does not have atoms.

Now, we obviously have

$$\int\log|e^{ix}-e^{iy}|\mu(dx)\mu(dy)=2\int_{x>y}\log\sin((x-y)/2)\mu(dx)\mu(dy).$$

Using this we argue that

$$\begin{aligned}&\int aV_1(x)+(1-a)V_2(\theta(x))\mu_{V_1}(dx)-2\iint_{x>y}\big(a\log\sin((x-y)/2)+(1-a)\log\sin((\theta(x)-\theta(y))/2\big)\mu_{V_1}(dx)\mu_{V_1}(dy)\\&\geq\int V_3\big(ax+(1-a)\theta(x)\big)\mu_{V_1}(dx)-2\iint_{x>y}\log\sin(((ax+(1-a)\theta(x))-(ay+(1-a)\theta(y))/2)\mu_{V_1}(dx)\mu_{V_1}(dy)\\&=E_{V_3}(\nu)\geq E_{V_3}(\mu_{V_3})\end{aligned}$$

where $\nu=(a\mathrm{id}+(1-a)\theta)_{\#}\mu_{V_1}$ and we used the concavity of $\log\sin(t)$ on $(0,\pi)$. The proof is complete. □

9. Hierarchical Implications

In this section we study the implications between the inequalities introduced. This is very similar to the classical inequalities.

9.1. **HWI and Log-Sobolev.** The following is the analog to the classical result of Otto-Villani from [19].

Corollary 3. (1) *For $\rho>0$, $HWI(\rho)$ implies $LSI(\rho)$.*

(2) *If $Q''\geq\rho-1/2$ for some $\rho\in\mathbb{R}$, then $T(C)$ with $C>\max\{0,-\rho\}$ implies $LSI(K)$ inequality with constant $K=\max\{\rho,\frac{(C+\rho)^2}{32C}\}$.*

Proof. (1) The conclusion follows from $ab-\rho a^2\leq b^2/(4\rho)$ for any real numbers a and b and $\rho>0$.

(2) In the case $\rho\leq 0$, then, $HWI(\rho)$ and $T(C)$ yields that for any $\delta>0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}E_Q(\mu)-E_Q(\mu_Q)&\leq\mathcal{W}_2(\mu,\mu_Q)\sqrt{I(\mu)}-\rho\,\mathcal{W}_2^2(\mu,\mu_Q)\\&\leq 4\delta I(\mu)+\frac{1}{\delta}\mathcal{W}_2^2(\mu,\mu_Q)-\rho\,\mathcal{W}_2^2(\mu,\mu_Q)\\&\leq 4\delta I(\mu)+\left(\frac{1}{C\delta}-\frac{\rho}{C}\right)\big(E_Q(\mu)-E_Q(\mu_Q)\big)\end{aligned}$$

which gives that for any $\delta > \frac{1}{C+\rho}$

$$E(\mu) - E(\mu_V) \leq \frac{4C\delta^2}{(C+\rho)\delta - 1} I(\mu).$$

Taking the minimum over $\delta > \frac{1}{C+\rho}$ gives the conclusion.

□

9.2. **Log-Sobolev implies Transportation.** In this section we show how the Log-Sobolev implies the transportation inequality. We use here the main idea from [15].

Theorem 10. *For a positive $\rho > 0$, $LSI(\rho)$ implies $T(\rho)$.*

Proof. Take a probability measure μ on $\mathbf{T}$ such that $E_Q(\mu) < \infty$. Thus the measure μ_Q does not have atoms and, according to Proposition 5, we can find a $u \in [0, 2\pi]$ such that there are lifts μ_u and $\mu_{Q,u}$ of μ and μ_Q to $[u, u + 2\pi)]$ such that they have the same mean.

Now, according to Theorem 5, we can represent the Wasserstein distance in the dual formulation and we will prove that the Log-Sobolev inequality implies the transportation inequality.

Take a fixed λ and a periodic smooth function $g : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ and define $g_t(x) = \mathcal{U}_t^\lambda f$. We have that

$$\partial_t g_t = -\frac{1}{4}(g_t' + \lambda)^2 \text{ with } g_0(x) = g(x). \tag{9.1}$$

Now assume that the Log-Sobolev inequality (8.9) holds for some constant $\rho > 0$.

For a given function ϕ on the circle (interpreted as a periodic function on the real line), define

$$j_Q(\phi) = E_Q - E_{Q-\phi}$$

and notice that

$$j_Q(\phi) \geq E_Q - E_{Q-\phi}(\mu) = \int \phi \, d\mu - (E_Q(\mu) - E_Q) \tag{9.2}$$

for any measure μ. In particular, this means that

$$E_Q(\mu) - E_Q \geq \int \phi \, d\mu - j_Q(\phi).$$

Now, take

$$h_t = (a + \rho t) g_t - j_t, \text{ with } j_t = j_Q((a + \rho t) g_t)$$

and consider ν_t the equilibrium measure of $Q - h_t$. Observe that this is well defined due to the fact that h_t is a periodic function, thus a smooth function on the circle. Notice that $j_Q(h_t) = 0$ and from this and (9.2) we obtain that,

$$E_Q(\nu_t) - E_Q \geq \int h_s d\nu_t$$

for any $s \geq 0$ and $t \geq 0$ with equality for $s = t$. This yields that $\int \partial_t h_t \, d\nu_t = 0$.

Now, applying $LSI(\rho)$ to ν_t and keeping in mind that $H\nu_t = Q' - h_t'$ (see [23]) on the support of ν_t, we obtain that

$$4\rho \int h_t \, d\nu_t \leq \int (h_t')^2 d\nu_t - \left(\int Q' d\nu_t \right)^2$$

which upon using (9.1) gives

$$4\rho(a + \rho t) \int g_t \, d\nu_t - 4\rho j_t \leq -(a + \rho t)^2 \left(4 \int \partial_t g_t \, d\nu_t + 2\lambda \int g' d\nu_t + \lambda^2 \right) - \left(\int Q' d\nu_t \right)^2.$$

Since $\int \partial_t h_t \, d\nu_t = 0$, we can continue with

$$4\partial_t \left(\frac{j_t}{a + \rho t} \right) \leq -2\lambda \int g_t' \, d\nu_t - \lambda^2 - \frac{1}{(a + \rho t)^2} \left(\int Q' d\nu_t \right)^2.$$

We observe now that because Q and h_t are C^1, combined with (2.7), we get that

$$\int (Q' - h_t')d\nu_t = 0.$$

Written differently, we obtain that $\int Q' d\nu_t = (a+\rho t)\int g_t' \, d\nu_t$ and this gives

$$-2\lambda \int g_t' \, d\nu_t - \lambda^2 - \frac{1}{(a+\rho t)^2}\left(\int Q' d\nu_t\right)^2 = -\left(\int g_t' d\nu_t - \lambda\right)^2.$$

Thus, we arrive at

$$4\partial_t\left(\frac{j_t}{a+\rho t}\right) \leq -\left(\int g_t' \, d\nu_t - \lambda\right)^2 \leq 0. \tag{9.3}$$

and then integrating this from 0 to 1 gives,

$$4\frac{j_1}{a+\rho} - 4\frac{j_0}{a} \leq 0.$$

Now, letting $a \searrow 0$ and a little thinking leads to

$$j_Q(\rho g_1) \leq \rho \int g \, d\mu_Q.$$

Combining this with (9.1), yields that for any (smooth) function g

$$\rho\left(\int g_1 \, d\mu - \int g \, d\mu_Q\right) \leq E_Q(\mu) - E_Q. \tag{9.4}$$

which, according to Theorem 5 and simple approximations yields

$$\rho \mathcal{W}_2^2(\mu, \mu_Q) \leq E_Q(\mu) - E_Q. \qquad \square$$

Notice that in principle we might get an improvement to the transportation inequality because in (9.3) we estimate the middle term by 0, which in principle can be integrated, though it is not clear how to interpret the result.

9.3. **Transportation, Log-Sobolev and HWI imply Poincaré.** The main result is the following.

Theorem 11. *Take a C^3 potential Q such that $\inf_T \frac{d\mu_Q}{d\alpha} > 0$. Then the following hold true:*

(1) *$T(\rho)$ implies $P(\rho)$;*
(2) *$LSI(\rho)$ implies $P(\rho)$;*
(3) *$HWI(\rho)$ implies $P(\rho)$.*

Proof. (1) Assume that the transportation inequality $T(\rho)$ holds for some $\rho > 0$. Then using the dual formulation from Theorem 5 with the notations from there, for real number λ and smooth periodic function $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$

$$\rho \int \mathcal{U}_1^\lambda f d\mu - \rho \int f d\mu_Q \leq E_Q(\mu) - E_Q(\mu_Q)$$

or equivalently,

$$E_Q(\mu_Q) - \rho \int f d\mu_Q \leq E_{Q-\rho\mathcal{U}_1^\lambda f}(\mu)$$

for any measure μ. Minimizing over all measures μ, we get that

$$E_Q - \rho \int f \, d\mu_Q \leq E_{Q-\rho\mathcal{U}_1^\lambda f}.$$

Now, replacing f by tf with small t and λ by $t\lambda$, and the easily checked fact that

$$\mathcal{U}_1^{t\lambda}(tf) = tf + t^2(f'-\lambda)^2/4 + o(t^2)$$

we arrive at

$$E_Q - \rho t \int f \, d\mu_Q \leq E_{Q-\rho t f - \rho t^2(f'-\lambda)^2/4 + o(t^2)}$$

which combined with (3.14), yields for small t,

$$E_Q - \rho t \int f d\mu_Q \leq E_Q - \rho t \int f \, d\mu_Q - t^2 \left(\frac{\rho^2}{2} \langle \mathcal{N} f, f \rangle - \frac{\rho}{4} \int (f' - \lambda)^2 d\mu_Q \right) + o(t^2).$$

This in turn implies

$$2\rho \langle \mathcal{N} f, f \rangle \leq \int (f' - \lambda)^2 d\mu_Q.$$

Finally minimizing over λ results with

$$2\rho \langle \mathcal{N} f, f \rangle \leq \int (f')^2 d\mu_Q - \left(\int f' d\mu_Q \right)^2$$

which is precisely $P(\rho)$.

(2) From the above implications, we know that Log-Sobolev implies the transportation, thus in particular also implies the Poincaré. However, we provide a direct proof here which is relatively simple and shows that the linearization of Log-Sobolev is also the Poincaré.

To see this, take a smooth function f such that $\int f \, d\alpha = 0$ and consider now the measure $\nu_t = \mu_Q - t\mathcal{N} f \alpha$. Notice that for small t this is well defined, in other words, a probability measure. In fact, we learn from (3.11) that

$$\nu_t = (1 - \mathcal{N}(Q + tf))\alpha.$$

Now apply $LSI(\rho)$ to obtain that

$$4\rho(E_Q(\nu_t) - E_Q) \leq \int (H\nu_t - Q')^2 (1 - \mathcal{N}(Q + tf)) d\alpha - \langle Q', \mathcal{N}(Q + tf) \rangle^2.$$

Notice now that from Proposition 1

$$\begin{aligned} E_Q(\nu_t) &= E_Q - t\langle \mathcal{N} f, Q \rangle + 2t \iint \log|z - w| \mathcal{N} f \, \alpha(dw) \mu_Q(dz) - t^2 \iint \log|z - w| \mathcal{N} f(z) \mathcal{N} f(w) \alpha(dw) \alpha(dz) \\ &= E_Q - t\langle \mathcal{N} f, Q \rangle - t \int \mathcal{E} \mathcal{N} f(z) \, d\mu_Q(dz) + \frac{t^2}{2} \langle \mathcal{E} \mathcal{N} f, \mathcal{N} f \rangle \\ &= E_Q + \frac{t^2}{2} \langle \mathcal{N} f, f \rangle \end{aligned}$$

where the cancellation of the coefficient of t is a consequence of Proposition 1. Furthermore, since $H(f\alpha) = (\mathcal{E} f)' = \mathcal{E} f'$ and $H(\nu_t) = H(\mu_Q) - tH(\mathcal{N} f \alpha) = Q' + t(\mathcal{E}\mathcal{N} f)' = Q' + tf'$ combined with the fact that $\mathcal{N}$ commutes with the derivative and the above computation, we arrive at

$$2\rho t^2 \langle \mathcal{N} f, f \rangle \leq t^2 \int (f')^2 \, d\mu_Q - t^2 \left(\int f' d\mu_Q \right)^2 + o(t^2),$$

which implies the Poincaré inequality $P(\rho)$ as set in (4.1).

(3) Since $HWI(\rho)$ implies $LSI(\rho)$, the proof follows.

□

Remark 2. *For the case of $Q = 0$, we proved $T(1/4)$, $LSI(1/4)$ and $HWI(1/4)$ which in turn imply $P(1/4)$, however a weaker result than the one in Theorem 4 which is the stronger $P(1/2)$.*

10. Potential independent inequalities

In this section we introduce some versions of the functional inequalities which are independent of the potential.

We start with the transportation inequality. The idea is the following. Assume that Q is an arbitrary potential on $\mathbf{T}$ and μ_Q is the equilibrium measure associated to it. Then, by the variational characterization of the equilibrium measure μ_Q, we know that

$$Q(z) \geq 2 \int \log|z - w| \mu_Q(dw) + C$$

with equality on the support of μ_Q. Consequently for any other measure μ, we have

$$E_Q(\mu) - E_Q = \int Q d\mu - \iint \log|z-w|\mu(dz)\mu(dw) - \int Q d\mu_Q + \iint \log|z-w|\mu_Q(dz)\mu_Q(dw)$$
$$\geq -\iint \log|z-w|(\mu-\mu_Q)(dz)(\mu-\mu_Q)(dw)$$

Thus it makes sense to define the following version of the relative entropy, one which is independent of the potential. For any two measures on $\mathbf{T}$ with finite logarithmic energy we set

$$\mathcal{H}(\mu,\nu) = -\iint \log|z-w|(\mu-\nu)(dz)(\mu-\nu)(dw). \tag{10.1}$$

The main result is a transportation inequality which is potential independent.

Theorem 12. *For any μ, ν,*

$$\mathcal{W}_1^2(\mu,\nu) \leq \mathcal{H}(\mu,\nu).$$

This is also sharp.

In particular, for any potential Q on $\mathbf{T}$, we have

$$\mathcal{W}_1^2(\mu,\mu_Q) \leq E_Q(\mu) - E_Q.$$

Proof. By careful approximations, it suffices to assume that $\mu - \nu = \phi\alpha$ for some smooth function $\phi : \mathbf{T} \to \mathbb{R}$. From (7.15) we have

$$\mathcal{W}_1(\mu,\nu) = \sup_{\lambda,g}\left\{\int g\, d(\mu-\nu) : |g(x)-g(y)-\lambda(x-y)| \leq |x-y|\right\},$$

where the supremum is taken over all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and periodic functions g.

Now, for any Lipschitz function g such that $|g'-\lambda| \leq 1$ (α-almost surely), (5.1) and the fact that the derivatives commute with $\mathcal{E}$ we obtain that

$$\int g\phi\, d\alpha = \langle g,\phi\rangle = \langle g', \mathcal{E}^2\phi'\rangle = \langle g'-\lambda, \mathcal{E}^2\phi'\rangle \leq \left(\int |g'-\lambda|^2 d\alpha\right)^{1/2}\left(\int |\mathcal{E}^2\phi'|^2 d\alpha\right)^{1/2}$$
$$\leq \langle \mathcal{E}^2\phi', \mathcal{E}^2\phi'\rangle^{1/2} = \langle \mathcal{E}^2\phi, \phi\rangle^{1/2}$$
$$\leq \langle \mathcal{E}\phi,\phi\rangle^{1/2} = \mathcal{H}(\mu,\nu)^{1/2}.$$

Tracing the inequalities we get that equality is attained for the case of $|g'-\lambda| \equiv 1$ (α-almost surely) and $\mathcal{E}^2\phi' = c(g'-\lambda)$ for some constant c which is attained for the case $\lambda = 0$ and $\phi = c\mathcal{N}^2 g$. There is though a problem with this, namely the fact that there is no smooth periodic function g such that $|g'| = 1$. However we can approximate g by C^1 functions such that $|g'| = 1$ is true only outside a set of small measure and in addition $|g'| \leq 1$. This in turn is enough to show that the inequality is actually sharp. □

To move forward with the Log-Sobolev inequality we need to find a replacement of the free information inequality, something similar to $\mathcal{H}(\mu,\nu)$ from (10.1). To do this, just notice that the free relative Fisher information is

$$I_Q(\mu) = \int (H\mu - Q')^2 d\mu - \left(\int Q' d\mu\right)^2$$

and if we recall that (at least formally) we have that

$$Q' = H\mu_Q,$$

then we can rewrite the above in the from

$$I_Q(\mu) = \int (H(\mu-\mu_Q))^2 d\mu - \left(\int H(\mu-\mu_Q) d\mu\right)^2$$

where we used the fact that $\int H\mu d\mu = 0$. If we want to make this quantity into one which is potential independent and also symmetric in μ and μ_Q one natural suggestion is to replace the integration from the integration with respect to the measure μ into an integration with respect to another measure which

is independent of both μ and μ_Q. Such a natural measure we can pick is the Haar measure α. Moreover, for measures of the form $d\mu = \phi d\alpha$ with ϕ a smooth function we can argue that

$$H\mu = (\mathcal{E}\phi)'.$$

Furthermore, since for $n \neq 0$, $\mathcal{E}z^n = \frac{1}{|n|}z^n$, we get that $(H\mu)(z) = i\text{sign}(n)z^n$. This shows that for any smooth, real valued function ϕ,

$$\int (H\phi)^2 d\alpha = \int \phi^2 d\alpha - \left(\int \phi d\alpha\right)^2.$$

Consequently we define for two probability measures μ, ν on $\mathbf{T}$

$$\mathcal{I}(\mu,\nu) = \begin{cases} \int \left(\frac{d\mu}{d\alpha} - \frac{d\nu}{d\alpha}\right)^2 d\alpha & \text{if } \frac{d\mu}{d\alpha}, \frac{d\nu}{d\alpha} \in L^2(\alpha) \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{10.2}$$

notice that we do not subtract the natural quantity $\int \left(\frac{d\mu}{d\alpha} - \frac{d\nu}{d\alpha}\right) d\alpha$ since this is already 0 in the case both μ and ν are absolutely continuous with densities in $L^2(\alpha)$.

With this definition we have the Log-Sobolev inequality in the form

Theorem 13. *For any measures μ, ν, we have that*

$$\mathcal{H}(\mu,\nu) \leq \mathcal{I}(\mu,\nu). \tag{10.3}$$

Equality is attained for the case $\mu - \nu = (a\Re(z) + b\Im(z))d\alpha(dz)$ for some $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proof. By standard approximation results, we can reduce the proof to the case of $\mu - \nu = \phi d\alpha$ where ϕ is a smooth function. Using the definition of $\mathcal{E}$, what we need to show is that

$$\langle \mathcal{E}\phi, \psi\rangle \leq \langle \phi, \phi\rangle$$

which immediately follows from the fact that the spectrum of $\mathcal{E}$ is $0, 1, 1/2, 1/3, \ldots$. Equality is also clear. □

In a similar vein we can also prove the HWI inequality which takes the following form.

Theorem 14. *For any measures μ, ν on $\mathbf{T}$,*

$$\mathcal{H}(\mu,\nu) \leq 2\sqrt{\mathcal{I}(\mu,\nu)}\mathcal{W}_1(\mu,\nu) - \mathcal{W}_1^2(\mu,\nu).$$

Proof. For the proof we just need to show it for measures μ, ν which are absolutely continuous with respect to α and in addition, the densities are also smooth. In addition, by a simple scaling argument it also suffices to do it for ϕ such that $|\mathcal{E}^2\phi'| \leq 1$.

The HWI inequality becomes equivalent to

$$\sqrt{\langle\phi,\phi\rangle} - \sqrt{\langle\phi,\phi\rangle - \langle\mathcal{E}\phi,\phi\rangle} \leq \sup_{\lambda,g}\left\{\int g\phi\, d\alpha : |g(x) - g(y) - \lambda(x-y)| \leq |x-y|\right\} \leq \sqrt{\langle\phi,\phi\rangle} - \sqrt{\langle\phi,\phi\rangle + \langle\mathcal{E}\phi,\phi\rangle}$$

The right hand inequality is a simple consequence of the transportation and Log-Sobolev inequalities.

To show the left hand inequality, just observe that for $\lambda = 0$ and $g = \mathcal{E}^2\phi$ that g is smooth periodic and $|g'| \leq 1$. In particular the supremum is bounded below by $\langle\mathcal{E}^2\phi,\phi\rangle$, thus it remains to show that

$$\sqrt{\langle\phi,\phi\rangle} - \sqrt{\langle\phi,\phi\rangle - \langle\mathcal{E}\phi,\phi\rangle} \leq \sqrt{\langle\mathcal{E}^2\phi,\phi\rangle}.$$

Writing, $\phi(z) = \sum_{n\neq 0} a_n z^n$ our task is now to show that

$$\sqrt{\sum_{n\neq 0} a_n^2} \leq \sqrt{\sum_{n\neq 0}(1 - 1/|n|)a_n^2} + \sqrt{\sum_{n\neq 0} a_n^2/n^2}.$$

Squaring and simplifying reduces it to

$$\sum_{n\neq 0}\frac{1}{|n|}\left(1 - \frac{1}{|n|}\right)a_n^2 \leq 4\left(\sum_{n\neq 0}\frac{1}{n^2}a_n^2\right)\left(\sum_{n\neq 0}\left(1 - \frac{1}{|n|}\right)a_n^2\right)$$

which follows simply from Cauchy inequality and the fact that $(1-1/|n|)\leq 1$.

□

11. Back to the classical case of functional inequalities

The free case on the circle opens up an interesting question in the frame of classical functional inequalities. To set up the scene, assume that M is a Riemannian manifold and G a Lie group acting on M with μ a probability measure on M, say of the form $\mu(dx)=e^{-V(x)}dx$, where dx is the standard volume measure on M. This is the usual setup for functional inequalities. Assume that V satisfies the typical Bakry-Emery condition

$$HessV+Ric\geq\rho I$$

for some positive ρ. Then all the classical inequalities, as for instance, the transportation, Log-Sobolev, HWI and the weakest of them, the Poincaré inequality as described in the introduction all hold true.

In this setup we can ask the following natural question.

Are there versions of these inequalities which take into account how far the measure μ is from being invariant under the group action?

For example we can ask about the simplest of them, namely the Poincaré inequality. One possibility is the following:

$$\rho\mathrm{Var}_\mu(\phi)\leq\int|\nabla\phi|^2d\mu-\left|\int\nabla_G\phi d\mu\right|_{\mathfrak{g}}^2 \tag{11.1}$$

where $(\nabla_G\phi)(x)$ is the element in the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ such that

$$\langle(\nabla_G\phi)(x),g\rangle=\frac{d}{dt}\big|_{t=0}\phi(\exp(tg)x)$$

where $\exp(g)$ is the exponential map from $\mathfrak{g}$ into G. We need to endow here $\mathfrak{g}$ with an appropriate metric which then is extended to an invariant metric on G. Obviously if the measure μ is invariant under the action of the group, then $\nabla_G\phi=0$ and thus we basically fall back into the classical case.

It would be interesting to see the transportation inequality and similarly Log-Sobolev in this framework. In particular, it would be nice to see a form of the Wasserstein distance which incorporates the action of the group G on the manifold M.

12. Thanks

The author wants to thank Michael Loss for useful discussions and the idea of using Fourier expansion in the proof of Proposition 6.

Many thanks to Haussdorf Institute in Bonn for its hospitality, great and stimulating environment during the trimester of mass transportation in 2015 where part of this paper was expanded and improved.

References

[1] Gerard Ben Arous and Alice Guionnet, *Large deviations for Wigner's law and Voiculescu's non-commutative entropy*, Probability Theory and Related Fields **108** (1997), no. 2, 183–215.

[2] Dominique Bakry, *L'hypercontractivité et son utilisation en théorie des semigroupes*, Lectures on probability theory (Saint-Flour, 1992), Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 1581, Springer, Berlin, 1994, pp. 1–114.

[3] Fabrice Baudoin and Nicola Garofalo, *Curvature-dimension inequalities and ricci lower bounds for sub-riemannian manifolds with transverse symmetries*, arXiv:1101.3590 (2011).

[4] Philippe Biane, *Logarithmic Sobolev inequalities, matrix models and free entropy*, Acta Math. Sin. (Engl. Ser.) **19** (2003), no. 3, 497–506.

[5] Philippe Biane and Dan Voiculescu, *A free probability analogue of the Wasserstein metric on a trace-state space*, GAFA - Geometric And Functional Analysis **11** (2001), 1125–1138.

[6] Sergey G. Bobkov, Ivan Gentil, and Michel Ledoux, *Hypercontractivity of Hamilton-Jacobi equations*, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) **80** (2001), no. 7, 669–696.

[7] Houdre Christian and Ionel Popescu, *Refinements of the one dimensional free poincaré inequality*, International Mathematical Research Notices **17** (2015), 8816–8851.

[8] Persi Diaconis and Steven N. Evans, *Linear functionals of eigenvalues of random matrices*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **353** (2001), no. 7, 2615–2633. MR 1828463 (2002d:60003)

[9] Wang F.-Y., *Functional inequalities, Markov properties and spectral theory*, Science Press, Beijing - New York, 2005.
[10] Nathael Gozlan, *A characterization of dimension free concentration in terms of transportation inequalities*, Ann. Probab. **37** (2009), no. 6, 2480–2498. MR 2573565 (2011a:60079)
[11] Leonard Gross, *Logarithmic Sobolev inequalities*, Amer. J. Math. **97** (1975), no. 4, 1061–1083.
[12] Fumio Hiai, Denes Petz, and Yoshimichi Ueda, *Free transportation cost inequalities via random matrix approximation*, Probability Theory and Related Fields **130** (2004), 199–221.
[13] Kurt Johansson, *On fluctuations of random hermitian matrices*, Duke Math. J. **91** (1998), 1–24.
[14] Michel Ledoux, *The concentration of measure phenomenon*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, vol. 89, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2001.
[15] Michel Ledoux, *A (one-dimensional) free Brunn-Minkowski inequality*, C. R. Acad. Sciences, Paris **340** (2005), 301–304.
[16] Michel Ledoux and Ionel Popescu, *Mass transportation proofs of free functional inequalities, and free Poincaré inequalities*, J. Funct. Anal. **257** (2009), no. 4, 1175–1221.
[17] ———, *The one dimensional free Poincaré inequality*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **365** (2013), no. 9, 4811–4849. MR 3066771
[18] Mylène Maïda and Édouard Maurel-Segala, *Free transport-entropy inequalities for non-convex potentials and application to concentration for random matrices*, Probab. Theory Related Fields **159** (2014), no. 1-2, 329–356. MR 3201924
[19] Felix Otto and Cédric Villani, *Generalization of an inequality by Talagrand and links with the logarithmic Sobolev inequality*, Journal of Functional Analysis **173** (2000), no. 2, 361–400.
[20] Ionel Popescu, *Talagrand inequality for the semicircular law and energy of the eigenvalues of beta ensembles*, Math. Res. Lett. **14** (2007), no. 6, 1023–1032. MR 2357472 (2009d:46119)
[21] ———, *Local functional inequalities in one-dimensional free probability*, J. Funct. Anal. **264** (2013), no. 6, 1456–1479. MR 3017271
[22] ———, *A refinement of the Brascamp-Lieb-Poincaré inequality in one dimension*, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris **352** (2014), no. 1, 55–58. MR 3150769
[23] Edward B. Saff and Vilmos Totik, *Logarithmic potentials with external fields*, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], vol. 316, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1997.
[24] M. Talagrand, *Transportation cost for Gaussian and other product measures*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **6** (1996), no. 3, 587–600.
[25] Cédric Villani, *Topics in optimal transportation*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, vol. 58, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2003.
[26] D. V. Voiculescu, K. J. Dykema, and A. Nica, *Free random variables*, CRM Monograph Series, vol. 1, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1992, A noncommutative probability approach to free products with applications to random matrices, operator algebras and harmonic analysis on free groups. MR 1217253 (94c:46133)
[27] Dan Voiculescu, *Limit laws for random matrices and free products*, Invent. Math. **104** (1991), no. 1, 201–220. MR 1094052 (92d:46163)